

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

COMMITTEE MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING  
1001 I STREET  
2ND FLOOR  
COASTAL HEARING ROOM  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2006

10:40 A.M.

TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
LICENSE NUMBER 12277

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Gary Petersen, Chair

Ms. Cheryl Peace

Ms. Pat Wiggins

BOARD MEMBER ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Margo Reid Brown

Mr. Jeffrey Danzinger

Ms. Rosalie Mul

STAFF

Ms. Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Ms. Debbie Balluch, Executive Assistant

Mr. Elliot Block, Staff Counsel

Ms. Bendan Blue, Board Advisor

Ms. Nancy Carr, Staff

Mr. Robert Conheim, Acting Deputy Director

Mr. John Duke, Staff

Mr. Rick Dunne, Board Advisor

Ms. Judy Friedman, Branch Manager, Organics & Resource  
Efficiency

Ms. Daisy Kong, Staff

Mr. Scott Harvey, Board Advisor

Mr. Jeff Hunts, Supervisor, Electronic Waste Recycling  
Section

Mr. Bill Orr, Branch Manager, Recycling Technologies

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF

Mr. Thomas Rudy, Staff

Mr. John Smith, Branch Manager, Recycling Business  
Assistance

Ms. Lorraine Van Kekerix, Acting Deputy Director

Ms. Shirley Willd-Wagner, Branch Manager, Electronic  
Waste Recycling Branch

Ms. Tabettha Wilmon, Staff

ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Katherine Brandenburg, The Flanigan Law Firm

Mr. Kirit Gajera, Canyon Plastics, Inc.

Mr. Sam Hong, Leading Industry, Inc.

Mr. Dennis Kazarian, E-Recycling of California

Mr. Leonard Lang, Allan Company

Ms. Anne Magana, Consolidated Waste Management Authority

Mr. Tom McCurdy, Consolidated Waste Management Authority

Mr. Mark Murray, Californians Against Waste

Mr. Joshua Yun, Leading Industry, Inc.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

	PAGE
Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum	1
Public Comment	1
A. Diversion, Planning And Local Assistance Deputy Director`s Report	2
B. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The City Of Kerman, Fresno County -- (May Board Item 10)	9
Motion	12
Vote	12
C. Consideration Of The Amended Consolidated Waste Management Authority Regional Agency Agreement, Tulare County -- (May Board Item 11)	13
Motion	18
Vote	18
D. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director`s Report	18
E. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application For Leading Industry, Inc. DBA Pinnacle Plastic Containers (Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Subaccount, FY 2005/06) -- (May Board Item 12)	25
Motion	30
Vote	31
F. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application For Unistar Enterprises, Inc. DBA Canyon Plastics, Inc. (Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Subaccount, FY 2005/06) -- (May Board Item 13)	31
Motion	36
Vote	36

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

v

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
G. Public Hearing And Consideration Of Adoption Or Request For Rulemaking Direction To Notice Revisions To The Proposed Regulations For The Implementation Of The Electronic Waste Recycling Act Of 2003 (May Board Item 14)	26
H. Board Workshop: Overview Of CIWMB Waste Characterization Studies and Tools -- (May Board Item 15)	70
I. Adjournment	129
J. Reporter's Certificate	130

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Welcome, good morning to  
3 the May 9th meeting of the California Integrated Waste  
4 Management Board Sustainability and Market Development  
5 Committee. I hope everybody -- did you all have to go  
6 down the stairs like 24 flights?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, all the rest of us  
9 were down here. You were upstairs.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: That will show me for  
11 being late to Committee.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Usual things, cell  
13 phones and pagers off. If you're going to address the  
14 Committee, please fill out a form and get it over to Deb.

15 Deb, raise your hand.

16 And on the hearing we're having today on e-waste,  
17 I'd appreciate it if you would please fill out a speaker  
18 form now and maybe jot down the specific interest you have  
19 in addressing the Committee on what your concerns are.

20 And with that, Deb, would you call the roll,  
21 please?

22 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Here.

24 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Here.

1 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Here.

3 I guess we'll start with Diversion, Planning, and  
4 Local Assistance. Lorraine, please.

5 Oh, public comment. I'm sorry. Before we head  
6 into our regular agenda this morning, is there anyone here  
7 that would like to address the Committee on matters that  
8 are not on the agenda?

9 Okay. You're on.

10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: I'm Lorraine  
11 Van Kekerix, the Acting Deputy Director for the Diversion,  
12 Planning, and Local Assistance Division. And I have a  
13 number of items to tell you about this morning. I wanted  
14 to let the Committee know about two -- actually, three  
15 workshops that the Office of Local Assistance is planning.

16 The first is a C&D forum, Closing the Loop on  
17 Construction and Demolition Materials. This forum will be  
18 held on May 31st in the Coastal Hearing Room from 9:00 to  
19 1:00, and we'll also be broadcasting that on the web. The  
20 focus of this workshop is to show how local governments  
21 can close the materials loop by developing infrastructure  
22 and markets related to C&D waste. It will provide an  
23 opportunity to learn from local governments some of the  
24 things that are currently being done and some of the  
25 things they plan for the future in relation to C&D

1 diversion.

2           The second set of workshops is a lot further off,  
3 but I thought I'd let you know because the topic has come  
4 up several times recently. And that is multi-family  
5 recycling workshops for local jurisdictions. These will  
6 be in September on the 13th here in Sacramento and on the  
7 28th down at the South Coast Air Quality Management  
8 District headquarters building in Diamond Bar.

9           Multi-family recycling is one of the few  
10 remaining frontiers for cities and counties as they work  
11 on increasing their diversion. Their efforts to serve  
12 apartments and condominiums with recycling have not always  
13 met with success. The workshop will offer strategies to  
14 overcome the challenges that are inherent in serving the  
15 multi-family sector, and they will be presented by cities  
16 and counties that already have effective multi-family  
17 recycling programs. So you may want to mark your  
18 calendars for those either to listen in or to attend.

19           In terms of annual reports, we have 423  
20 jurisdictions that are required to submit their electronic  
21 annual reports. That was on March 1st. And to date, 420  
22 of those have submitted their annual reports.

23           The three remaining jurisdictions, if they don't  
24 file their report by June 1st, will receive a 30-day  
25 notice that the Board will begin the process of



1 considering issuing a compliance order if we don't receive  
2 the reports. So we have been working closely with those  
3 jurisdictions to try to get them to submit their reports.

4 We also have three outstanding reports on the  
5 time extensions that ended as of January 1st. And if  
6 those three jurisdictions do not submit their reports,  
7 they will be moved to an early biannual review and  
8 recommended for compliance orders. And our Local  
9 Assistance staff are continuing to work with these  
10 jurisdictions as well as going out to meet with local  
11 government representatives across the state to discuss the  
12 information that's been provided in the annual reports.

13 In terms of the State agency annual reports that  
14 were due on April 1st, we have 316 reports in house.  
15 Forty-three have been started but not submitted, and 47  
16 have not been started. And staff is continuing to work  
17 with those agencies which have not yet completed their  
18 reports or submitted their reports to encourage them to  
19 completely submit those annual reports to us for 2005.

20 Another reporting kind of function is related to  
21 disposal reporting. The revisions of 2005 disposal data  
22 on what jurisdiction it came from and how much are due  
23 from counties and regional agencies by May 15th. So we're  
24 looking forward to getting those.

25 And finally, in relation to venues and events,

1 staff from the Office of Local Assistance worked with the  
2 City of Indio and event promoters to conduct a waste  
3 assessment at the Coachella Valley Music Festival on April  
4 29th and 30th of this year. The event is attended by  
5 approximately 60,000 people per day, and staff is  
6 analyzing those findings and we will provide  
7 recommendations to the city and the event promoter to  
8 improve diversion of solid waste generated at this event  
9 because it's an annual event.

10 And that concludes my Deputy Director's report.

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. So we're on to --  
12 one second. Question.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: You were saying there  
14 were 40-something State agencies that haven't started.

15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Yes.  
16 Forty-seven State agencies have not yet started the annual  
17 reports which were due on April 1st.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Is this normal? Do we  
19 usually have this many at this late of time?

20 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: I would say  
21 it's about normal. It takes -- we end up having complete  
22 compliance from the State agencies, but it has always  
23 taken quite an effort on the staff's part to actually get  
24 all the reports submitted.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Since you really can't

1 do anything to them, do you have any suggestions of what  
2 we can do to get them to at least report on time? Is  
3 there anything? Any suggestions?

4 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Well, we can  
5 think about some suggestions. What we've been doing is  
6 basically calling. We may want to think about upping the  
7 level of pressure, and I'd be happy to come up with a list  
8 of options.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Or just reporting. I  
10 know Pat had mentioned before putting the names in the  
11 paper for the ones that hadn't complied. Maybe put them  
12 in the paper for the ones that are late or send a list to  
13 the Legislature saying this bill requires them to submit a  
14 report, and these are the ones that -- do we ever do that?

15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We haven't  
16 done that in the past.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Does anybody think that  
18 would help?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Maybe it's time.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: It just seems like we  
21 ought to be able to do something, if they're already a  
22 month-and-a-half late starting to do the report.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I think it's a good idea.  
24 Lorraine, let's figure this out.

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Okay.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: It's just a shame our  
2 staff has to spend so much time telling them to do  
3 something they're mandated to do.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You're always chasing them  
5 to get the reports in?

6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I have one question --  
8 sorry. Go ahead.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Is it the same old  
10 people that are late?

11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: You know, I  
12 couldn't tell you that, but I will have staff put that  
13 information together for you.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: That's fine. Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Lorraine, on the special  
16 events thing in Indio, how many of these have we done like  
17 this?

18 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We have done  
19 a number of them. I don't know the total. I can check  
20 and get back to you.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Are we like adjusting and  
22 we're trying to figure out specific events to see how we  
23 get it all so we can collect as much as possible?

24 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Correct.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: This is a work in

1 progress; right?

2           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Right. We  
3 have tools out that were recently made available on our  
4 website. So we've been preparing the tools, going out and  
5 working with various venues around the state, a wide  
6 variety of different types to get the information together  
7 to put together case studies and also to do some assisting  
8 jurisdictions on figuring out what works, because they  
9 have to report on this starting with the next annual  
10 report. So they will have to be reporting on the success.  
11 So we want to have helped with various kinds of events and  
12 have case studies so that they have time to get those  
13 things implemented before their report.

14           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So will we have a standard  
15 guideline that we can hand to an event coordinator and say  
16 here's what you need to do?

17           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We don't  
18 necessarily have a standard guideline, but we have  
19 guidelines for them to go through to see which things  
20 apply to them.

21           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.

22           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Different  
23 venues are going to have different kinds of situations.  
24 And so we've tried to make it flexible so they know what  
25 to consider to make it successful for their particular set

1 of circumstances.

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you.

3 I also forgot to do ex partes for our members.

4 Cheryl?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I just said hello to

6 Dennis Kazarian and to Pat Schiavo.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Pat?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I'm current. I think

9 the Flanigan Law Firm was already recorded. It went to  
10 everybody.

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I spoke to Dennis Kazarian  
12 as well, John Cupps, Chuck White, Katherine Brandenburg,  
13 Pat Schiavo, and Leonard Lang. Okay.

14 I think we're on to Board Item Number 10.

15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX:  
16 Consideration of the Amended Nondisposal Facility Element  
17 for the City of Kerman in Fresno County. And John Duke of  
18 the Office of Local Assistance will be making this  
19 presentation.

20 MR. DUKE: Good morning, Committee members.

21 The City of Kerman is amending its Nondisposal  
22 Facility Element, NDFE, to identify and describe the Mid  
23 Valley Disposal, Recycling, and Transfer Station Facility.  
24 The proposed facility will be processing recycling,  
25 construction, and demolition debris, green waste, mixed

1 loads of municipal solid waste. The permit for this  
2 facility will be coming forward to the Board at a future  
3 meeting.

4 The City has submitted all required documentation  
5 for the amendment, and staff therefore recommends its  
6 approval. This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any comments?

8 I have something I'd like to say about this, and  
9 it's popping up all over the state in different ways. But  
10 I'm raising the question on environmental justice. And  
11 the agenda item indicates there are no environmental  
12 justice issues. The City has developed a bilingual  
13 outreach program to inform its residents of the City's  
14 waste diversion programs. And that's great.

15 But what's being done to educate the community  
16 about the project? By my estimate, the entire city  
17 generates about 45 tons per day of solid waste and daily,  
18 and the proposed project's 500 tons a day for the  
19 facility; is that correct?

20 MR. DUKE: I believe that's correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: For both recyclables and  
22 mixed solid waste.

23 Kerman is a small, diverse, and low income  
24 community with approximately population of 9,600; 65  
25 percent of which is Hispanic; and more than 20 percent

1 below the poverty level. I'm hopeful the city government,  
2 the operator, our local enforcement agency are taking all  
3 necessary steps to ensure the community is fully informed  
4 about the project and their residents are provided with  
5 every possible opportunity to participate meaningfully as  
6 it moves forward through the CEQA and permitting process.

7 Can someone tell me where they are in the CEQA  
8 review and local permitting for the project?

9 MR. DUKE: Yes, I believe that was approved. So  
10 that has been approved December 12th, 2005.

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. And we've done a  
12 yoman's job in communicating? Do you know they have  
13 communicated to the community? Everybody knows what's  
14 going on?

15 MR. SWINDEN: Yes, I believe so.

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Is the impact with the  
17 expanded facility going to deal with local jobs in that  
18 community?

19 MR. DUKE: I'm aware they are going to look into  
20 hiring people specifically from that community if they're  
21 eligible.

22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Great. So with  
23 that is there any other comments?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I think those are some  
25 good things to bring up, because all the time in our Board



1 packets we see environmental justice issues, it says none.  
2 But a lot of times we know there are some because these  
3 communities are very impacted by the number of these types  
4 of facilities that are in their community.

5           So I think I'd like to actually see some more  
6 things in the environmental justice to maybe say how many  
7 facilities are in that area. I don't know if that's  
8 probably going to be so much more work for staff. But  
9 when you read this, it's like no issues, but you know  
10 there must be.

11           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And one other question.

12           COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: But there's nothing we  
13 can do about it. There's nothing we can actually do about  
14 it because all those are local decisions.

15           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Being an old-time recycler  
16 and sympathetic to communities and how we do stuff, I'd  
17 like to see everybody is involved and on the same page is  
18 what I'm trying to get. So do I have a motion?

19           COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move  
20 Resolution 2006-71.

21           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Second?

22           COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second.

23           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb, call the roll,  
24 please.

25           EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

2 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

4 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

6 We'll put that on the consent agenda, please.

7 Item Number 11.

8 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: This is the  
9 Consideration of the Amended Consolidated Waste Management  
10 Authority Regional Agency Agreement for Tulare County.  
11 And Tabetha Wilmon will be making the presentation for  
12 staff.

13 MS. WILMON: Good morning.

14 On December 8th, 1999, an agreement was entered  
15 into by the cities of Visalia, Porterville, Lindsay,  
16 Dinuba, and Tulare to create a Joint Powers Authority.

17 On December 14th, 1999, the Board approved their  
18 formation as a regional agency to be known as the  
19 Consolidated Waste Management Authority, or the CWMA.

20 Effective November 26th, 2002, the CWMA amended  
21 its Joint Powers Authority, or its JPA, to include the  
22 cities of Exeter, Farmersville, and Wood Lake as members  
23 of the JPA. Subsequently, on September 16th, 2003, the  
24 Board approved an amendment to the regional agency  
25 formation agreement that added those cities to the CWMA.

1           The CWMA again amended its JPA on November 17th,  
2   2005, to add the unincorporated area of Tulare County as a  
3   new member and on January 26th, 2006, to remove the city  
4   of Wood Lake from its membership. The CWMA is now  
5   requesting to amend its Regional Agency Formation  
6   Agreement to reflect these latest JPA membership changes.

7           Public Resources Code Section 40970 allows cities  
8   and counties to form a regional agency for the purpose of  
9   meeting the State's waste diversion goals. If approved by  
10   the Board as a regional agency, the agency will be  
11   responsible for compliance with the waste diversion  
12   requirements set forth in Public Resources Code Section  
13   41780.

14           Board staff recommends the Board approve Option  
15   1, which is Board approval of the Consolidated Waste  
16   Management Authority's amendment to its Regional Agency  
17   Formation Agreement. This concludes my presentation. And  
18   representatives from Tulare County, the city of Wood Lake,  
19   and the CWMA are also here today.

20           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any comments?

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I guess I was just kind  
22   of interested to read that the city of Wood Lake is asking  
23   to be removed because it would allow them to reduce their  
24   administrative costs. And I always thought that they form  
25   these regional agencies -- one of the benefits was to

1 reduce their administrative costs. So I thought that was  
2 interesting.

3 Also the cities of Wood Lake, Exetor and  
4 Farmersville, the new members, are they contiguous at all  
5 with the ones that are already there?

6 MS. WILMON: Actually, there are eight cities I  
7 believe and then the unincorporated county. And five of  
8 the cities had originally joined. The remaining three  
9 cities joined, so it was all the cities except for the  
10 county. Now the county has joined, except for Wood Lake  
11 who is pulling out at this point. It's contiguous except  
12 for the city of Wood Lake.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: That's great. Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: That was my question.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Wood Lake is doing their  
16 own thing because they're above 50 percent and they're  
17 rocking and rolling?

18 MS. WILMON: That's correct. Prior to joining  
19 the regional agency, they were pretty high and they have a  
20 pretty good program.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We have a -- anybody else  
22 comment? We have a speaker, Mr. Tom McCurdy and Anne  
23 Magana. I hope I said that right. Please.

24 MR. MC CURDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name  
25 is Tom McCurdy. I am the interim Administrator. And Anne

1 Magana is the new full-time Administrator that started  
2 last week for the CWMA.

3 I am one of the original staff members with the  
4 forming of the JPA. I began with City of Lindsay back in  
5 1985, so I've been through the whole process. And I'd  
6 like to state that our goal has always been to be all  
7 inclusive and for all the agencies to work together to do  
8 the best recycling and diversion that we can. I have been  
9 pushing for a full-time Administrator to run the program  
10 on a full-time basis, and we have finally hired Anne  
11 Magana to fill in that position. So I'm kind of on my way  
12 out and turning it over to her.

13 What I might state is that in the beginning  
14 before the actual JPA was formed, we tried to -- we worked  
15 with Tulare County to try to get them to be a member. Was  
16 unsuccessful at that. The five cities moved forward. And  
17 then subsequently, the three additional cities decided to  
18 come in. All of them have been very cooperative in  
19 running programs and working together for the betterment  
20 of our county jurisdictions.

21 I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank  
22 Tabetha for all the help she's given us. As I said, I've  
23 done this on an interim basis, and your staff has been  
24 great to work with.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you, Tom.

1 And Anne Magana, sorry.

2 Tabetha, thank you. Very good.

3 I guess with that, do I have a motion?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I have a question.

5 What would the diversion rate be without Wood Lake for

6 the --

7 MR. MC CURDY: Wood Lake's percentage of

8 participation is like 2.7 percent of the total. Even

9 though they are a higher diversion rate than the agency as  
10 a whole, we believe it will be fairly small. I don't know

11 what that number is exactly, but --

12 MS. WILMON: Actually, I can tell you what the

13 diversion rates for Wood Lake prior to then. In 2000 and

14 2001, they were in the 60s, 70s. And again, they're a

15 very small portion of the total regional agency. The

16 regional agency itself is in the high 40s, and the county

17 is about 50 percent. So I believe the county has also

18 just implemented a new C&D program. They were on a SB

19 1066 Time Extension so they implemented several new

20 programs. I anticipate their diversion rates are going to

21 go up higher also.

22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you,

23 Tabetha.

24 Anything else? Thank you very much.

25 Do I have a motion?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move

2 Resolution 2006-70.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second the motion.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb, call the roll,  
5 please?

6 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

8 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

12 Great. We'll put that on consent agenda as well.

13 Item Number 12 -- oh, wait. You better give your  
14 report, Bob.

15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Would you like  
16 the report?

17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm a little confused this  
18 morning. Fire drills.

19 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: That's what we  
20 do is fire drills around here.

21 I'm Bob Conheim, Acting Deputy Director for Waste  
22 Prevention and Market Development Division. And in my  
23 Deputy Director's report I would like to talk to you about  
24 International Compost Week, the state of the -- give you a  
25 little fun status report on the RMDZ Program, and talk

1 about two topics in e-waste that are not part of the  
2 regulatory hearing.

3 International Compost Week is being promoted and  
4 supported by the U.S. Composting Council. And in  
5 Sacramento, we're at Cal/EPA and the Board doing a number  
6 of things to help educate the public on the importance of  
7 using compost to improve soil health, conserve water,  
8 reduce pesticide and fertilize usage, and reduce storm  
9 water runoff.

10 We have two television spots on KXTV Channel 10's  
11 Sacramento and Company. Andrew Hurst, formerly with the  
12 Board and now with Cal/EPA, appeared on April 27th to  
13 discuss vermaculture. And yesterday our very own Ken  
14 Decio partnered with Harold Duffy from the City of  
15 Sacramento Department of Utilities to highlight backyard  
16 composting. So we're getting quite a bit of exposure.

17 In addition, we are exhibiting educational  
18 information at our booth in the lobby displaying a home  
19 composting bin in the courtyard and having two guest  
20 presentations, vermaculture with Larry Royal from Earth  
21 Worm Soil Factory on May 9th, today at 2:00 p.m., and  
22 water and filtration and erosion control using compost  
23 with Hillary Ganns from BFI on May 10th. Please note the  
24 Earth Worm Soil Factory previously received a \$300,000  
25 loan from our RMDZ Loan Program, and their business has



1 been doing very well.

2           What we do -- I want to turn to RMDZ and make  
3 some general remarks. What we do when we bring loans in  
4 the months we bring loans, we give you a little fun  
5 condition report. So I wanted to just give you a couple  
6 of bullets about the fund condition. On July 1st at the  
7 start of the fiscal year, 05-06, there were \$22.2 million  
8 available for new loans. In December 2005, the Board  
9 received 10 million for the final installment of a loan  
10 sale.

11           To date for this fiscal year, the Board has  
12 approved nine loans for 9.3 million. During this fiscal  
13 year, nine loans totaling 10.1 million have been closed,  
14 and one closed loan was approved by the Board for -- one  
15 of these closed loans was approved by the Board in fiscal  
16 year 04-05.

17           There are two Board-approved loans yet to be  
18 closed for 671,000 and change. One pending loan was  
19 approved by the Board for a prior fiscal year.

20           The current amount remaining for future loans for  
21 this fiscal year available is \$21.5 million. And this  
22 month the Board will consider two loans in the amount of  
23 2.2 million. If these loans are approved, then there  
24 remains \$19.2 million in the sub-account for new loan  
25 applications.

1           I want to make a couple of remarks about e-waste  
2 issues that are not part of the regulation discussion  
3 today. The first is that we're going to bring to you an  
4 item later on in another month on the e-waste recycling  
5 fee and payment schedule. We have to adjust or leave the  
6 same according to the law. And in order to gather data  
7 for this Board action, all approved collectors and  
8 recyclers are required to submit the annual net cost  
9 report. In accordance with e-waste regulations, these  
10 reports were due to the Board on March 1st, 2006.

11           One-hundred-seventy-three participants did not  
12 submit a report. The e-waste staff sent letters to  
13 approved participants who either did not submit a report  
14 or submitted their report late. The ones who did not  
15 submit a report received a Notice of Violation stating  
16 that if the report is not received by May 15th, their  
17 status as an approved collector and recycler can be  
18 revoked. Forty-five participants received notice of late  
19 filing stating no further action would be taken but  
20 acknowledging that they filed late.

21           Last week, Program staff fielded numerous phone  
22 calls from recipients of these letters. They weren't  
23 happy getting the letters. We believe many of those in  
24 violation did not actively participate in the system in  
25 2005. The net cost reporting requirement may serve to

1 weed out inactive participants.

2           Staff provided extensive training and guidance  
3 materials on how to prepare and submit net cost report  
4 including two online Internet webinars -- actually  
5 webinars through a very sophisticated facility. These  
6 webinars were attended by about 100 approved collectors  
7 and recyclers. And in addition, numerous reminders about  
8 the report due date were sent by e-mail and through our  
9 listserve. We feel that this activity in which we sent  
10 out letters acknowledging the violations it's important to  
11 be consistent and proactive enforcing this regulatory  
12 requirement, especially in the beginning of the program.

13           Next month we will present a Board item  
14 concerning the e-waste recycling fee and payment schedules  
15 after having acknowledged the information that we got.  
16 And I have available for you, but it would take an awful  
17 long time to read, a list of the specific outreach  
18 activities that we did. Because the question has arisen  
19 from Board members in the past when a requirement was  
20 either complained about or was not complied with or there  
21 were evidence that it wasn't understood very well what  
22 outreach efforts have you made. And I have a list of in  
23 detail nine specific outreach activities very specific  
24 which I can -- if you're interested in more information,  
25 we can pursue that.

1           The other the last thing that I want to report is  
2   that E-Waste Program staff will be participating in a  
3   SWANA, Solid Waste Association of North America, webinar  
4   discussion on May 10th that compares and contrasts  
5   California's electronic waste with that of Washington  
6   State. The webinar allows attendees from all over the  
7   country to listen and learn from the convenience of their  
8   own desks through the Internet and a conferencing phone  
9   system.

10           CIWMB staff will present an overview and status  
11   report on the California program and respond to  
12   participant questions. And this is different because  
13   we're going to get an outreach reaching back from people  
14   we don't normally have a lot of contact with. And the  
15   point that I want to make about webinars is that we're  
16   trying to use them more extensively. We see the webinar  
17   tool as a low impact, low cost means to reach far-flung  
18   audiences with up-to-the-moment information and guidance.  
19   And it generates a lot of interest.

20           And with that, I will close out the Deputy  
21   Director's report for this month and be available. I see  
22   questions on the tip of your tongue.

23           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Here they come. Go ahead.

24           COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I was just curious how  
25   does California stack up with other states with the

1 e-waste? There's going to be a report coming with  
2 Washington.

3           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: California is  
4 the most implemented state at this point. We were the  
5 ones that got out in front. There are different states --  
6 and we actually could provide an informational agenda item  
7 or a written report to you on other states. But the other  
8 states' programs are very different. Some are more  
9 product stewardship. Some just involve a manufacturer  
10 paying a fee. Some are hybrid programs in which a fee  
11 jumpstarts the program and then manufacturers and  
12 retailers take over. So California is the most  
13 implemented and probably the only advance recycling fee  
14 and fee-based payment based system that has gone as far as  
15 this one has. Is that a fair statement?

16           ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR  
17 HUNTS: Yes.

18           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: It's the most  
19 sophisticated advanced recycling fee and payment-based  
20 system.

21           COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Well, you say there's  
22 going to be a webinar about Washington State on e-waste  
23 versus California.

24           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: We're  
25 participating in a SWANA sponsored webinar that happens to

1 be focusing on brand-new legislation that is now just  
2 beginning to be implemented in the state of Washington.  
3 And the reason that's significant to us is that the west  
4 coast has been California only for up until now. And now  
5 Washington is jumping in with both feet, slightly  
6 different program, but --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Very good. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Cheryl?

9 So our program here is probably the most  
10 aggressive, if you will, in the country?

11 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

12 HUNTS: The most mature.

13 Jeff Hunts.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well said.

15 As long as it works. And I know we have a ways  
16 to go here, and we'll deal with some of this later on  
17 today.

18 Any other comments? Okay, Bob. Can we go to  
19 Item 12?

20 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Item 12 and 13,  
21 Committee Items E and F, I will introduce them together.  
22 They are two loans that are coming to you for approval.  
23 Daisy Kong of the Recycled Market Development Loan Program  
24 who is with John Smith will present both of those items to  
25 you right now.

1 MS. KONG: Good morning.

2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning.

3 MS. KONG: The item I'm presenting is Agenda Item  
4 E, May Board Item 12, Consideration of the Recycling  
5 Market Development Revolving Loan Program application for  
6 Leading Industry, Inc, dba, Pinnacle Plastic Containers.  
7 The applicant is located in the city of Oxnard within the  
8 Ventura County RMDZ Zone.

9 The loan request is for \$955,000 and is for the  
10 purchase of a PET sheet extrusion system. Pinnacle  
11 Plastics has been in business since 1981. They  
12 manufacture plastic containers made from recycled PET  
13 flakes, and they project to increase the diversion of this  
14 waste material by 1300 tons annually as a result of this  
15 RMDZ loan. It also plans to hire ten more employees.

16 The Permitting and Enforcement Division has  
17 reviewed applicant's permit requirements and determined  
18 that a solid waste facility permit is not required for the  
19 operation.

20 The Diversion, Planning, and Local Assistance  
21 Division, DPLA, has reviewed the project and determined  
22 the material processed by the applicant is normally  
23 disposed in the landfill.

24 The RMDZ Loan Committee met on May 4th, 2006, and  
25 had voted unanimously to approve the loan request. Staff

1 recommends the Option Number 1, to approve Number 1 and  
2 adopt Resolution 2006-83 to approve an RMDZ loan to  
3 Leading Industry, Inc., dba, Pinnacle Plastic Containers  
4 in the amount of \$955,000.

5 This concludes my presentation. The President of  
6 Lead Industry, Sam Hong, and Company Controller, Joshua  
7 Yun are here to answer any questions the Committee may  
8 have. Thank you.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I had a question. I  
10 have two questions. First, what is a sheet extrusion  
11 system?

12 MS. KONG: I think I'll let them answer. Explain  
13 that better than me.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good afternoon. Good  
15 morning.

16 MR. HONG: Good morning.

17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Would you state your name?

18 MR. HONG: Sam Hong.

19 MR. YUN: Joshua Yun. I'm the Controller, and  
20 he's the President of the Company.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Would you help us with  
22 that question, please?

23 MR. HONG: A sheet extrusion will be extruded by  
24 the extrusion line. It's necessary before we form  
25 container we need sheet. And that --



1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: You need what?

2 MR. HONG: We need a pre-formed sheet.

3 MS. KONG: It's like a roll.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's like a paper mill  
5 that rolls it out into a big sheet, and they stamp the  
6 containers out as it goes on the other side of the roll;  
7 is that correct?

8 MR. HONG: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Thank you. This is  
10 not a question for you. It's a question for staff. The  
11 Loan Committee, who's on the Loan Committee and how did  
12 they get appointed to the Loan Committee?

13 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: They're both  
14 representatives from public and private lending  
15 institutions with about half public and half private. And  
16 the Loan Committee members are brought to the Board to be  
17 nominated. And the Board selects those Loan Committee  
18 members. Their primary purpose is to look at the credit  
19 aspects of the application to see if the applicant has the  
20 ability to repay the loan and they provided sufficient  
21 collateral and match for the project.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: How many members are  
23 there?

24 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Nine.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: And the Board approves

1 all of them?

2 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Right. And they serve for  
3 four years. We haven't -- I think the last one we brought  
4 was last November. The terms typically expire in the late  
5 part of the calendar year, so you may not have been here.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Cheryl, questions?

8 Okay. I have a couple. First of all,  
9 congratulations on what you guys are doing. I love this  
10 stuff, building your infrastructure here in the state.

11 Now, the supply of PET that you're getting, most  
12 of it is post-consumer, correct?

13 MR. HONG: Yes, most of it is post-consumer.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You're filling with  
15 pre-consumer when you can't get post-consumer?

16 MR. HONG: Correct?

17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: How does the market look  
18 to you right now, say in the next year or so, for the  
19 availability of PET with all of our collection programs  
20 and recycling? Are we going to have a short supply? Are  
21 we going to be oversupplied? What do you see?

22 MR. HONG: We had a supply problem in the past a  
23 year or two because we couldn't find any local wash lines.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right.

25 MR. HONG: Now we are working with two new

1 suppliers in our industries. So we're excited about that.  
2 And I think our needs are met with the two suppliers that  
3 are coming on.

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Now, will you guys be  
5 looking towards expanding, which I hope you're looking to  
6 do. Create more lines and produce more materials, so  
7 we'll get Wal-Mart to order from you and all the rest of  
8 those guys so this really gets going?

9 MR. HONG: Correct.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good. That will work.  
11 Listen, thank you very much. And congratulations  
12 and great job. I'd like to come and see your facility as  
13 well.

14 MR. HONG: Please.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.

16 Also I'd like to introduce our Chairwoman Margo  
17 Brown and Jeff Danzinger from the Board. Hi, guys.

18 Okay. Do I have a motion, or does anybody else  
19 have anything else to say?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I'd like to move  
21 Resolution 2006-83.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second the motion.

23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb.

24 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

1 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

3 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

5 Okay. We're on to 13.

6 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Fiscal consent?

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah. We'll do that. All  
8 right.

9 MS. KONG: The next agenda item is Agenda Item F,  
10 May Board Item Number 13, Consideration of the Recycling  
11 Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application for  
12 Unistar Enterprises, Inc., dba, Canyon Plastics, Inc. At  
13 this point I would like to point out for the record the  
14 legal name of the borrowing entity is Canyon Plastics,  
15 Inc. Staff spoke with the company's attorney and received  
16 confirmation paperwork that the company has amended its  
17 corporate name to Canyon Plastics, Inc., and it no longer  
18 uses a dba or fictitious name.

19 Canyon Plastics is currently located in the city  
20 of Santa Clarita where they've been since 1969. It's  
21 within the Santa Clarita RMDZ. The company is proposing  
22 to add another processing facility in the city of Valencia  
23 which is within the Los Angeles County RMDZ. This loan  
24 actually would be the first loan that we're making to the  
25 Santa Clarita RMDZ, so we're excited.

1           The purpose of this loan is to acquire the  
2 proposed Valencia processing facility to purchase waste  
3 reduction equipment to be used at the Santa Clarita site  
4 and to fund working capital needs. Canyon Plastics is a  
5 manufacturer of injection and blow molded products made  
6 from recycled HTPE, polypropylene, ABS, nylon, and  
7 polycarbon. It projects to increase the diversion of  
8 these waste material by 506 tons annually and hire an  
9 additional 15 employees as a result of this loan.

10           The Permitting and Enforcement Division has  
11 reviewed the applicant's permit requirements and  
12 determined that a solid waste facility permit is not  
13 required for its operation. The Diversion, Planning, and  
14 Local Assistance Division has reviewed the project and  
15 determined that the material processed by the applicant is  
16 normally disposed of in a landfill.

17           The RMDZ Loan Committee met on May 4th, 2006, and  
18 had also voted unanimously to approve the loan request  
19 subject to clarification from the applicant's attorney as  
20 to the legal name of the borrowing entity, and as  
21 indicated earlier that issue had been resolved.

22           Staff recommends that the Committee approve  
23 Option Number 1 and Resolution Number 2006-84 to approve  
24 an RMDZ loan application to Canyon Plastics, Inc., in the  
25 amount of 1.3 million.

1           This concludes my presentation. Mr. Kirit  
2 Gajera, owner and President of Canyon Plastics, is here  
3 with us if there are any questions. Thank you.

4           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any questions?

5           COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: I'm just a little  
6 confused about they make end products, but they also --  
7 they're sold to manufacturers of plastic products. Can  
8 you explain?

9           MS. KONG: They also make parts, assembly parts.  
10 So they do the part and then go on to the manufacturer to  
11 make end product.

12          COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: And they assemble -- I  
13 see. Because they recover waste material from their own  
14 waste and then they recycle it into their own product?

15          MS. KONG: Are you referring to the waste  
16 reduction portion? Right. Okay. And I think?

17          CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Is a member -- good.

18          MS. KONG: When they go through the manufacturing  
19 process, they have some waste material they cut off and  
20 there will be ends and stuff they normally would throw  
21 away. But in this case with the waste reduction  
22 equipment, they can recover those materials.

23          COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Thank you.

24          CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Kirit, hi. I guess  
25 there's no other questions. What would you like to say?

1 And I have some questions. Go ahead.

2 MR. GAJERA: Go ahead with your questions.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, good. Well, on your  
4 process, you're taking actually your trimmings and you're  
5 recycling back into the parts again?

6 MR. GAJERA: Correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You use mostly  
8 post-consumer materials?

9 MR. GAJERA: Mixed.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Mixed. Okay. Have you  
11 used pre-consumer materials as well?

12 MR. GAJERA: Small portion, but yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And the same thing goes, I  
14 asked the other firm what they're going to do. This is  
15 exciting, and it's really good you guys are doing this.  
16 Do you see -- now you take a variety of materials and  
17 produce a variety of products. Where do you see in your  
18 role here through the recycling industry using a lot more  
19 material, post-consumer coming up? That's your plan,  
20 obviously if you're expanding; right?

21 MR. GAJERA: Lately, to get the virgin material,  
22 fresh material, it's becoming a little difficult. So yes,  
23 we are definitely excited about reusing more recycling  
24 material right now.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So you have to buy from

1 processors who have already basically made flake or  
2 pellets for you; is that correct?

3 MR. GAJERA: Some. We generate our own. I have  
4 a couple of examples if I get permission I can bring and  
5 show you.

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm sorry?

7 MR. GAJERA: I have a couple of examples what is  
8 being generated in my own plant.

9 MS. KONG: He brought some products.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Let's see. Show and tell.

11 MS. KONG: They buy primarily from Talco  
12 Plastics, so it's mixed.

13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, our friends there.

14 MR. GAJERA: We have company called American  
15 Cleaners. We do lots of products for them like pressure  
16 washer. This is the tank we are making right now for  
17 them. And to make this tank, we have this much material  
18 is wasted. This is like from top and bottom flake. So  
19 with this new program, we should be able to recycle this  
20 waste. It goes back in the machine, and we can sell as a  
21 good parts.

22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So you actually regrind it  
23 yourself?

24 MR. GAJERA: Correct. With this program.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Well, that's



1 exciting. Good job. Well, make your plant bigger next  
2 year and buy more post-consumer stuff, and we'll really  
3 get going here. This is a good thing.

4 MR. GAJERA: We are expanding and buying another  
5 building.

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good. Great. Any other  
7 questions? Thank you very much.

8 Do I hear a motion for this?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I think this is great.  
10 I'd like to move Resolution Number 2006-84 revised.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Second the motion.

12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb.

13 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Peace?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

15 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Wiggins?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Aye.

17 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?

18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.

19 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Fiscal consent?

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Please.

21 I guess we're on to the public hearing on the  
22 e-waste regulations. We can start that right now. You  
23 ready? By the way, if there's any -- oh, good, Mark. Who  
24 else has got speaker slips in? Okay. Good.

25 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Mr. Chair and

1 members, Bob Conheim again for the Waste Prevention and  
2 Market Development Division.

3 Today and right now is the appointed time and  
4 place for the legally required or legally established  
5 public hearing for the permanent e-waste regulations.  
6 Jeff Hunts and Shirley Willd-Wagner will give you more  
7 details of how we're going to proceed.

8 But this is part of the beginning of the process  
9 to get us to a set of permanent regulations so that the  
10 program can continue in existence. If we do not get  
11 regulations adopted by you, the Board, and approved by the  
12 Office of Administrative Law by December 13th, 2006, the  
13 program comes to a halt.

14 And I would simply give you if it is the benefit  
15 or at least a statement of based on my experience that in  
16 terms of regulation years, December 13th is just around  
17 the corner. It's a wake up.

18 So we would like to entertain all the comments  
19 that people have. We've had a wonderful relationship with  
20 our regulated community and with the participant  
21 community. And we would like to efficiently proceed and  
22 get to a point where we have a set of regulations which  
23 you feel comfortable in adopting as permanent regulations.  
24 And the program will grow, and we hope it grows. And we  
25 will be in a position to continually entertain changes to

1 the permanent regulations as the program matures.

2 And with that, I would like to turn it over to  
3 Jeff Hunts and Shirley Willd-Wagner.

4 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

5 HUNTS: Okay. Thank you, Bob.

6 Good morning, Chair.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning.

8 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

9 HUNTS: I'm Jeff Hunts, Supervisor of the Covered  
10 Electronic Waste Recycling Program. And the item before  
11 the Committee this morning is a combined public hearing  
12 and consideration item on the proposed regulations to  
13 implement certain portions of the Electronic Waste  
14 Recycling Act of 2003. The proposed regulations primarily  
15 govern the Covered Electronic Waste Recovery and Recycling  
16 Payment System, but also establish requirements for the  
17 Manufacturer Payment System as well as the Manufacturer  
18 Reporting.

19 Since the fall of 2003, the Waste Board has  
20 convened nearly 20 meetings, workshops, and hearings to  
21 work out in partnership with stakeholders a functional  
22 approach to implementing and administering the pioneering  
23 provisions of SB 20. Program and interested parties have  
24 heretofore operated under the luxury of emergency  
25 regulations which have allowed for the rapid

1 implementation and a degree of timely flexibility when  
2 revisions were deemed necessary.

3           Neither program nor stakeholders have taken the  
4 privilege of emergency regulations lightly, and the Waste  
5 Board has maintained its tradition of inclusive public  
6 input. Now we are in the midst of formal rulemaking,  
7 which is a much more prescribed and deliberative process.  
8 The formal noticed 45-day comment period has closed, and  
9 we are about to hold the public hearing.

10           We arrived here today with relatively little  
11 acrimony in large part due to the Board's open process  
12 along the way which included an urgent regulatory revision  
13 to the emergency regulations in November of 2005, which  
14 allowed certain unresolved concepts such as source  
15 anonymous waste and local government designations to be  
16 vetted and included in the rules governing the program.

17           The proposed final regulations before the  
18 Committee today are based largely on the existing  
19 emergency regulations. Experience has shown that these  
20 regulations have worked, albeit not always perfectly. But  
21 we're at a good starting point for the rulemaking  
22 discussions.

23           In February of this year, this Committee directed  
24 Program to file formal notice with the Office of  
25 Administrative Law and initiate the 45-day comment period

1 on the proposed regulations. As Program awaited  
2 stakeholder comments, the task of daily operations  
3 continued. And here's where the program stands today. We  
4 have over 400 approved collectors in the program, 46 of  
5 which are dual entity collector/recyclers. In 2005, we  
6 received 225 claims for over \$31 million representing in  
7 excess of 31 million pounds of covered electronic waste.  
8 And thus far in 2006, we received 52 claims for \$7.6  
9 million, or 16 million pounds.

10 In addition to shepherding the final regulation  
11 process, Program's priority objectives of late have been  
12 to draw down the backlog of payment claims that resulted  
13 from continued program growth. And through redoubled  
14 efforts and some redirected resources, we are making very  
15 good headway on that. Program is also in the midst of  
16 implementing fully revised and standardized internal  
17 procedures to make the best use of technological resources  
18 available to staff and to prepare for an anticipated  
19 Department of Finance audit.

20 And a quick side note. The Department of Finance  
21 did recently conduct a random desk audit of the program's  
22 operations and expressed initial satisfaction with the  
23 level of documentation that the current regulations  
24 governing the program require, though DOF recognizes the  
25 need for the program to more fully implement audit and

1 investigative capabilities to go along with the  
2 documentation requirements. And that brings us to the  
3 topic de jure which is the proposed regulations.

4 As I mentioned, yesterday at 5:00 p.m. the 45-day  
5 public comment period closed. Up until about 24 hours  
6 ago, Program had received only one formal paragraph of  
7 comments on the proposed regs. Though to be fair, we  
8 received some advanced drafts from interested parties.

9 And then the comments came in. And about 35  
10 pages of comments came in in the last 24 hours. And staff  
11 is now getting a chance to examine those closely and fully  
12 evaluate the views expressed by stakeholders.

13 Major themes we've been able to ferret out of the  
14 comments include a revisiting of the legislative intent  
15 and raised questions about how the program is currently  
16 fulfilling those intents.

17 Continued concern over the definition of a  
18 California source.

19 General reservations regarding the overall  
20 required level of documentation and recordkeeping.

21 Concern over the transfer of source documentation  
22 between collectors and recyclers.

23 A desire for standardized forms for use by all  
24 participants.

25 Uncertainty regarding the utility of the net cost

1 reporting requirements.

2 Questions regarding the reasonable effort  
3 requirements for collectors to determine whether CEWs come  
4 from a California origin.

5 Suggestions to expand the weigh master  
6 requirements for all participants and not just limit that  
7 to recyclers.

8 Concerns regarding recovery payment requirements  
9 between a recycler and a collector including time frames,  
10 reimbursements, and standard payment rates, and how the  
11 Waste Board should or could adjudicate disputes in those  
12 transactions.

13 Concerns regarding the flow of documentation as  
14 part of payment claims.

15 Questions about requiring specific disposition of  
16 certain treatment residuals, such as CRT glass, prior to  
17 making payment claims.

18 An interest for requiring increased disclosure  
19 from recyclers to collectors on the fate of CEWs that are  
20 transferred but not canceled.

21 Recommendations for expanding opportunities for  
22 reuse through payments for CEWs collected but not  
23 canceled.

24 Desire for expanded access to appeals processes  
25 in response to payment claim adjustments.

1           Concern that the Waste Board has yet to establish  
2   recycling goals, and therefore has no program metrics.

3           And general support for requirements intended to  
4   expand cost-free opportunities for the public to properly  
5   discard unwanted covered electronic waste.

6           Not surprisingly, a term used frequently in the  
7   comments about the proposed regulations was burdensome.  
8   Also not surprising were the frequent comparisons made to  
9   California's beverage container redemption laws. And it  
10   should be noted that some comments directly conflict with  
11   comments submitted by others.

12           Clearly, Program staff has a lot of analysis in  
13   the coming days and probably the coming weeks, and we look  
14   forward to fully assessing and appreciating the concerns  
15   of stakeholders as well as continuing our conversations  
16   with other agencies such as DTSC which regulates the  
17   proper handling of this hazardous waste; the Division of  
18   Recycling; the Department of Finance; and the Attorney  
19   General's Office, which would prosecute fraud and other  
20   crimes.

21           Before we move into the public hearing portion of  
22   today's meeting, I'd like to comment on two areas of  
23   regulation that Program staff put forward for proposed  
24   revisions in Attachment 2 to the item. These areas would  
25   be the definition of the California source and the scope



1 of recovery payments between recyclers and collectors.  
2 The purpose of the definition of a California source is to  
3 establish fundamental eligibility of a covered electronic  
4 waste and to exclude those materials that could be been  
5 brought into California speculatively, opportunistically,  
6 or fraudulently or in the past or in the future.

7           While the current definition and the proposed  
8 revision in practice could probably serve the purpose, the  
9 intended purpose, our hope that the elegant and easy fix  
10 continues to vex both the program and stakeholders alike.

11           I believe that we received some very good input  
12 in the last 24 hours that will assist staff in revisiting  
13 this particular matter, and we will be returning to the  
14 Board with a new and improved definition of a California  
15 source for Board consideration.

16           But on the matter of recovery payments, it has  
17 been truly fascinating to observe how government  
18 intervention in the marketplace has impacted the economics  
19 of this industry. The traditional structure has literally  
20 been turned on its head. What was initially worried to be  
21 a situation within which recyclers would hold all the  
22 cards and dictate the terms of business has been flipped.  
23 Program now regularly receives complaints from recyclers  
24 regarding the demands of collectors above and beyond the  
25 current 20 cent per pound recovery payment.

1           To remove any suggestion from regulation that  
2 collectors should expect more than the standard statewide  
3 recovery payment rate, staff proposes to revise wording  
4 contained in Attachment 2. Note that nothing in the  
5 regulations otherwise precludes participating parties from  
6 engaging in business arrangements to provide incentives,  
7 attract materials, or reward preferred behaviors. Outside  
8 of the regs, it's business.

9           Looking ahead on the calendar, Program has  
10 entertained a very faint hope of being able to digest all  
11 the comments received in writing and heard today at the  
12 public hearing and returning to the full Board next week  
13 with proposed revisions. At this point, I believe that's  
14 a very, very faint hope. Alternatively, the program will  
15 likely return in June to the Board and Committee cycle  
16 with proposed revisions after a thorough evaluation of the  
17 comments, secure direction, and make a new draft available  
18 for public comment and then seek further direction or  
19 consideration of adoption in July.

20           As this Committee knows and as Bob mentioned  
21 earlier, the program is operating on a deadline with  
22 emergency regulations that will expire in December. As  
23 the task at hand demonstrates, each additional comment  
24 availability potentially adds two perhaps three months to  
25 the rulemaking process. So it's imperative for Program to

1 get it right sooner rather than later. With that, and  
2 barring any initial questions from Board members, the  
3 program now looks to the Chair to formally open the public  
4 hearing process.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you very  
6 much.

7 Are there any questions?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Yeah, I have a  
9 question. The additional 15-day comment period starts  
10 from the Board meeting on May 16th?

11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Not necessarily,  
12 Member Wiggins. The California Administrative Procedure  
13 Act which governs the adoption and approval of regulations  
14 requires that changes to proposed regulations that are  
15 within the scope of the original 45-day notice must be  
16 made available for 15 days before the adopting agency is  
17 allowed to adopt them. So it actually is whenever we as  
18 staff put them out on the web, when we fix that date. And  
19 it is unlikely that it would be conterminous with a Board  
20 meeting or an adoption. It would usually be after we had  
21 word processed and done some things based on direction  
22 from the Board or comments at a public hearing.

23 But then because the Board works on a Board and  
24 Committee public meeting cycle, when that 15 days is up,  
25 then the Board can consider at its Committee or Board

1 meeting the text of regulations when we get a package  
2 that's ready for adoption. So there's kind of a double  
3 set of requirements: Our scheduling, and the specific  
4 legal requirements of the California Administrative  
5 Procedure Act.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: What is the date that  
7 the 15-day comment period starts? Have you fixed the  
8 date?

9 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: No, because we  
10 haven't -- because we are still tinkering with our  
11 proposed changes to the regulations. And we will probably  
12 have them fixed in enough time to come back into the June  
13 Committee and Board cycle. And when the Board gives us  
14 direction if they like -- if you like what we've done with  
15 those changes or with the changes that we bring in the  
16 June cycle, then as the Board's procedures have dictated,  
17 the Committee can tell us to start the 15 days. And so we  
18 would miss the June Board meeting for adoption and be well  
19 in hand having had the 15-day period expire before the  
20 July Committee and Board cycle started.

21 And one factor that you should take into  
22 consideration is that after the public hearing and once we  
23 start tinkering with the regulations and producing changes  
24 in the draft that are made available for the 15 days, the  
25 California Administrative Procedure Act is very clear that

1 the only comments that are required to be considered by  
2 the public are those that relate to those 15-day changes.  
3 You can't go back and reopen a discussion of things you  
4 forgot to say about the -- or that you'd like to  
5 reemphasize about the whole package.

6 The availability of comments by the public  
7 narrows drastically as the -- and is limited only to the  
8 changes that are made in each subsequent 15-day  
9 availability. So that is good for efficiency, and it  
10 requires that the public has its shot today. And then  
11 when we take into consideration those comments, there  
12 really shouldn't -- they don't need to make them again  
13 because they've been taken into consideration.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thanks, Bob.

15 Any other comments? Jeff.

16 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: Go ahead, Cheryl.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: When you were doing your  
18 presentation, you mentioned the Division of Recycling.

19 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

20 HUNTS: Yes.

21 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: What is their role in this  
22 program?

23 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

24 HUNTS: Experience with a program that involves a fee and  
25 State payments, the Bottle Bill.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Just like an advisory?

2 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

3 HUNTS: Yes. And statute specifically suggests to the  
4 Board that it consult with other agencies who may have  
5 some experience in this arena.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So it's just consulting.

7 BOE does the collection. DTSC, don't they do the --

8 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR

9 HUNTS: DTSC regulates the actual physical management of  
10 this material, because it's considered a hazardous  
11 material.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I remember we got like  
13 two more positions or something or auditing or some sort  
14 of enforcement.

15 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
16 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: In budget year  
17 06-07, I believe there are three investigative positions.

18 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: At the Board or at DTSC?

19 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
20 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: CIWMB.

21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Jeff.

22 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: Jeff, in your comments,  
23 you mentioned something about recyclers complaining about  
24 the demands of some collectors who are demanding in  
25 addition to the 20 cents a pound. Can you like elaborate

1 on that? I mean, what's going on?

2 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC

3 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: Sure. In some  
4 cases, and I think increasingly so, there's a realization  
5 amongst collectors that the recycler needs to be fed and  
6 needs to be fed eligible material that is well documented.  
7 And they know how much money the recycler is getting paid  
8 from the State through the recycling payment of 28 cents.  
9 And just as in any market economy, they shop for who can  
10 give them the best price. So while there's the 20 cent  
11 per pound -- and I'm sure we might hear some --

12 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: They're looking at it as  
13 a floor?

14 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC

15 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: They're looking  
16 at it as a floor. It's not a floor. It's the rate. What  
17 we've attempted to do with Attachment 2 is remove  
18 suggestion that the rate is open to negotiation. The rate  
19 is the 20 cent per pound currently. There is nothing in  
20 the regulations that prohibit a recycler from offering,  
21 I'll provide you bins. I'll throw in transformation.  
22 I'll find some other way to sweeten the deal if you'll  
23 bring me your covered electronic waste. We want to make  
24 sure the regulations do not impart the suggestion or  
25 perception that the standardized statewide recovery

1 payment rate is open to negotiation. I don't know if you  
2 have Attachment 2 in front of you there. It talks about  
3 shall pay at a minimum or at least --

4 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: It says at least, and  
5 that's struck.

6 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
7 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: We're saying  
8 that a recycler shall pay the rate in regulation. But  
9 outside of that, there's no prohibition on doing business.

10 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: Okay. Thanks.

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'd also like to recognize  
12 Member Mulé is in the back in the room.

13 Any other comments?

14 I have a couple. And, Bob, I'm going to agree  
15 with you, because we went through this on the Refund Act  
16 in the regulations and what we went through with that, and  
17 it was quite an experience. And I know this is going to  
18 be -- we're going to have growing pains here, and we're  
19 going to have to make adjustments. But I think that where  
20 we're at right now I think we're in good ground, and I  
21 don't want to hold this thing up. I want to make sure we  
22 get this thing moving and we hit the deadlines and move  
23 on.

24 And I guess before we open this public hearing,  
25 I'd like to make a statement, please. The purpose of this



1 hearing is for stakeholders to comment on the proposed  
2 regulations to implement certain portions of Electronic  
3 Waste Recycling Act of 2003. In general, these  
4 regulations are the rules that will govern the activities  
5 of participants in the Covered Electronic Waste Recycling  
6 Program.

7           Comments should be as focused and specific as  
8 possible, citing section names and numbers where  
9 applicable. Comments on the underlying enabling statute  
10 or the Board's administration of the program in general  
11 may not be appropriate for this hearing unless such  
12 comments pertain directly to a proposed regulation. If  
13 you have submitted written comments, it's not necessary to  
14 duplicate your comments in oral testimony. Please use the  
15 hearing time to clarify your comments.

16           In the interest of time, I will ask that you not  
17 repeat the testimony of earlier speakers. Neither the  
18 Board nor Program staff anticipated responding to comments  
19 today. However, we may ask questions to gain a better  
20 understanding of the concerns expressed and to determine  
21 specific suggestions. After the hearing today, staff will  
22 consider all comments received during the proceeding  
23 45-day comment period presented and this public hearing and  
24 return to the Board with proposed revisions as  
25 appropriate. If the Board gives direction to staff to

1 make available another 15-day comment period, the scope of  
2 subsequent comments must be then limited only to the items  
3 that have been proposed for the revisions; correct?

4 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Correct.

5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Okay.

6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yes.

8 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR CONHEIM: I want to assure  
9 you, the Board, and the members of the public, that all  
10 comments submitted in writing -- and because we're going  
11 to make an extra effort, all comments we are able to  
12 capture from the oral testimony will be responded to in  
13 the formal rulemaking.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. And I also think  
15 that some of the comments and input you're going to get  
16 from the people in the street who actually understand all  
17 this from former experiences will probably be valuable and  
18 I'm looking forward to this. This is good.

19 Without any hesitation, I'd like to open the  
20 public hearing, and Mr. Dennis Kazarian, please.

21 MR. KAZARIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board  
22 members. I did send in my testimony, so it's there. I'm  
23 not going to reiterate that. I always sound like a broken  
24 record. But I want to thank the staff again as usual  
25 because again that communication they've had with the

1 collectors, recyclers, and the public has been great.

2           The net cost reporting issue still confused a lot  
3 of people, but they reached way out. And we have a lot of  
4 collectors who got into the system this year and not sure  
5 if they're supposed to be into the system or report. So  
6 that became a lot of confusion. But it was a great job,  
7 and I do like that web cast. That was great.

8           The one issue I did want to bring up -- and I'm  
9 not sure it's regarding regulation. It may have to be  
10 statute or maybe a direction from the Board. But the next  
11 step I think that you need to give more authority, more  
12 enforcement to the staff and the ability to go and look at  
13 the material, look at our sites, see where it's going and  
14 see what's going on.

15           I think there's some concern or at least from the  
16 recyclers that inadvertently at times we get documentation  
17 or we get material that's rejected by the State of  
18 California. And because we may have documentation that  
19 doesn't quite match up or doesn't work or wasn't filed  
20 correctly, and that may be inadvertently.

21           On the other hand, there are certain kinds of  
22 material and vendors that we're apprehensive about. When  
23 that shows up or that kind of material is rejected or that  
24 kind of information of rejection or some kind of punitive  
25 action is taken, we at least at the recycling level would

1 like to know where that -- that should be provided  
2 someplace for us to see. So we can look at, you know,  
3 what material or what was rejected or who was rejected or  
4 what discipline. So that gives us a better idea in the  
5 industry. Very touchy subject. I'm going to be very  
6 careful about that. But we would like to know what this  
7 is and where it is.

8 And I think there's other concerns going on on  
9 some kinds of stuff. And I think that right now the only  
10 enforcement is DTSC, and they really enforce how we handle  
11 the material. We think it would be a good idea to have  
12 the Integrated Waste Management Board begin to have some  
13 of that ability to do that. Thank you. Appreciate  
14 everything.

15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

16 Mr. Leonard Lang.

17 MR. LANG: Mr. Chair, Members, I thank you for  
18 this opportunity to address the importance of the  
19 rulemaking direction.

20 First let me say this has been a lot of work. As  
21 Mr. Conheim has spoken, you need to address every  
22 regulation, and this has been our first shot at it since  
23 the emergency regulation. And like all things that have  
24 urgency and importance, there's always more you can do  
25 when you've got more resources. Sometimes we just run

1 out. What we're embarking on here is a whole new world  
2 where people are actually getting a charge for something  
3 they know is going to have to be recycled in the future.  
4 They will require education, and I do urge you to start on  
5 that program as soon as possible with all seriousness and  
6 urgency. And remember, you don't have enough staff.

7           We as recyclers and collectors require more  
8 education ourselves. Let me make one important thing  
9 clear about the manufacturers who's devices will  
10 ultimately become the e-waste regulated under this  
11 program. And we see more to come. They obviously are a  
12 very important part of this entire process. Based on  
13 their representatives' comments, I perceived that  
14 manufacturers see this law as a new tax on their industry.  
15 I understand their concern, but I think it's misplaced. I  
16 truly believe the proper education from experienced  
17 recyclers, the manufacturers, will come to understand this  
18 program can be a benefit for them and their customers and  
19 the marketplace. And with the proper approach, there are  
20 very real and concrete things they can do to save both  
21 time and money.

22           Speaking for collectors, recyclers, and I have  
23 been involved in the ISRI comments. We are members of  
24 ISRI. Like the Bottle Bill before it, I've got 19 years  
25 experience in that program, so I understand the regulatory

1 process. And that's why the money paid into this program  
2 needs to be looked at as an investment, not as a tax, not  
3 as a fee, but investment. As was discussed, this program  
4 is the premier program in the United States. We need to  
5 take care with it. And that's why I spent a lot of time  
6 on it.

7 Now if I may take a moment. Mr. Chairman, I  
8 started in this business in 1969. I know folklore has it  
9 shortly after Gary Peterson invented recycling with the  
10 Volkswagon bus. But with all that aside, you have learned  
11 this business from the ground up. You have taken a  
12 progressive trip throughout our industry culminating in  
13 this destination. And I don't think it's by chance that  
14 you're here at this time and in this place. And I'm  
15 thankful that you are.

16 Now with that, I'm with the Allan Company. I've  
17 got 25 years experience in the business. I've managed CRV  
18 programs. I've run material recovery facilities. I have  
19 a background in legislation and regulation that goes back  
20 to the '80s with the Bottle Bill and AB 939. And in our  
21 younger days, we did fall in with a renegade group known  
22 as the Gang of Five.

23 Allan Company is one of the largest recyclers in  
24 the state and the country. We are members of ISRI, the  
25 largest recycling organization. We are also members of

1 ACRI, the Association of California Recycling Industries,  
2 which are the largest paper recyclers, and I am the past  
3 President.

4 Our company serves public business, local  
5 governments, and we do curbside processing for the likes  
6 of City of Los Angeles and the City of San Diego. In this  
7 program, we represent 14 collectors.

8 As I stated before, the process here is not well  
9 understood. I don't want to go through the 20 pages of  
10 comments that I made, out of the approximately 35 that  
11 Jeff refers to.

12 And let me say this, that I have been involved in  
13 this process a lot before and the staff here is a joy to  
14 work with, an absolute joy. You need to know that.

15 But I do speak to significant restructuring in  
16 this program. And I do draw heavily on the Bottle Bill.  
17 And I boil it down into what I call the three Cs. Costs:  
18 The way you structure these regulations now are going to  
19 effect the costs of this program now and down the road in  
20 the future, and especially as new things get added. So  
21 you need to be attentive to that. I think pulling from  
22 the Bottle Bill structure will save a lot of reinventing  
23 the wheel. So I've spoken to that in my comments.

24 I've spoken to the documentation as I see it and  
25 the expense it adds to the program. I spoken to the way

1 the billing is. I like the Bottle Bill structure where  
2 the cancellation is not a factor for the processor to be  
3 paid. I think that would be beneficial in this program.

4 And then I speak to if we don't keep these costs  
5 down, then in the future that cost to the consumer has got  
6 no place to go but up. And I would hope we wouldn't have  
7 to do that. This is still a program in its infancy.

8 I speak to the second C, which is corruption,  
9 fraud. It will escalate costs more than you can imagine,  
10 and I think it has in the Bottle Bill. But I've made  
11 recommendations that I think will address that. Qualified  
12 people will do that.

13 And then I've spoken to competition, that you  
14 need to encourage competition, because that will keep the  
15 costs down. But again, we bring fraud back into the issue  
16 here. Fraud makes a competitor a super competitor,  
17 because they've got a lot more money to throw around, and  
18 they do. We've experienced it. We've fought against it.  
19 It's not a fun thing.

20 You do have a deadline of December 13th. I know  
21 that's going to be a big job, especially with what's been  
22 commented on. And that requires, like I say, you folks  
23 are going to have to be educated yourself. You're going  
24 to have to educate the Legislature, the Administration on  
25 the resources that this program needs, because right now



1 it's lacking. You've asked the impossible I think of a  
2 good staff. And there's a long way to go. I thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Leonard. Well  
4 said.

5 Okay. Katherine Brandenburg, please.

6 MS. BRANDENBURG: Thank you very much. My name  
7 is Katherine Brandenburg. I'm with the Flanigan Law Firm,  
8 and we represent the Institute of Scrap Recycling  
9 Industries.

10 And there really isn't much more I need to say.  
11 Jeff summarized our comments very well. The previous  
12 speakers have also talked about our issues, which is we  
13 are very glad that staff is going to look and talk to  
14 Department of Conservation concerning the lessons they've  
15 learned with fraud and how they have curtailed it with the  
16 Bottle Bill Program. Also looking at changing the  
17 definition of California sources, we appreciate that.

18 And I think that's about it. Everything else has  
19 been said, and we did put in our comments. And I  
20 appreciate everything that the staff and Board has done.  
21 And we're always available to talk to anyone and give us,  
22 you know, advise from what we have learned over the years.  
23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Katherine.

25 Mr. Mark Murray.

1           MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, Members, Mark Murray  
2 with Californians Against Waste. It is good to see you  
3 here in person, Mr. Chairman.

4           And I want to underscore something that Jeff  
5 Hunts said in his presentation that I just don't think  
6 should escape from any of you that are new Board members.  
7 It is absolutely significant how little acrimony there is  
8 at this point given the history of this issue. And I  
9 think it's really testament to the work this Board and  
10 your staff has done to come together during the emergency  
11 regulation process. You don't have to do that. You  
12 didn't have to invest as much time in the public process  
13 in getting feedback during that emergency reg process.  
14 You did, and it's paying dividends right now. And I'm  
15 confident you're going to hit that December 13th date with  
16 these permanent regulations. And the fact it's only a  
17 couple of malcontents that have a couple needling things  
18 that we have for you, again it's testament to the great  
19 work of the staff.

20           I'm going to -- I did get my comments in, as Jeff  
21 pointed out to me this morning -- or I guess last night he  
22 was still working after 5:00 -- at the last minute, but  
23 there are only two pages. And there are really only two  
24 points that I have to make. And Jeff has identified one  
25 of those points already that they are already going to be

1 looking at that. That is the definition of California  
2 source. And just to very simply, what we are proposing is  
3 that a California source be a device that's generated in  
4 the state of California. Meaning, it's used in the state  
5 of California. It's not tied to the individual consumer  
6 that purchased that. So that's the issue that we have  
7 with the definition. I think that, you know, others have  
8 a slightly different take on that definition. But to me,  
9 that's the piece that we would like to see examined. And  
10 we've provided language to accomplish that.

11           The second issue that I want to raise that has  
12 not been raised yet in this forum, although I have to tell  
13 you that there's a lot of discussion of it happening out  
14 there in the hinterland of the recycling world, and that  
15 has to do with what is the impact of this program on  
16 reuse. And I'm getting a lot of that feedback right now  
17 as we're pursuing legislation to expand this program to  
18 the CPU, desktop computer.

19           And right now I think that in the statute the  
20 Legislature as part of the intent of this law actually did  
21 say it was the intent to encourage reuse. Then the  
22 statute is silent on the specifics of where does reuse fit  
23 in. And the regulations define -- in my mind define the  
24 term cancellation in a manner that effectively precludes  
25 the payment for devices that are reused. And this is an

1 issue that frankly was very thoughtfully discussed in the  
2 emergency regulation process. And I'll admit that I lost.  
3 Other recyclers came to the table and said the market for  
4 reuse is very strong, and we don't need payments to  
5 collectors and recyclers to cover reuse. Just because I  
6 lost doesn't mean that I'm not right. And I still think  
7 that these regulations should re-examine that issue of  
8 reuse.

9 I think it's an important -- it may not be the  
10 biggest issue in the world of CRTs and video display  
11 devices, but I think it's going to be a huge issue in this  
12 expansion to the CPUs. And I'm asking you in this  
13 regulatory process to evaluate mechanisms for not  
14 precluding payments on reuse. And I just have to as a  
15 sidebar tell you that it's one of the issues we are going  
16 to as the sponsor of AB 3001 we're going to address in  
17 that legislation. It's come up in analyses of the bill.  
18 It's come up from opponents of the bill, concerns about is  
19 this program actually encouraging reuse. It should be  
20 encouraging reuse. And certainly that's one of the  
21 primary tenants of the Board is to encourage reuse.

22 I do want to just one final point echo a point  
23 that I think where the recyclers are coming from.  
24 Mr. Chairman, you have a great deal of experience with the  
25 bottle and can recycling law. The structure of this

1 program parallels the bottle and can recycling law in that  
2 there are collectors and recyclers. The regulations  
3 dealing with enforcement on collectors and recyclers in  
4 the Bottle Bill is different from this program in that the  
5 Department of Conservation has direct regulatory authority  
6 and takes enforcement actions directly on the collectors.

7 I think that what the recyclers are proposing is  
8 that the Board consider that as part of the evolution of  
9 these regulations, consider the notion of direct  
10 enforcement, direct regulation of collectors.

11 Now, you may be thinking we don't have the  
12 resources to do the enforcement and deal with the program  
13 we have right now. I don't want you to be shy about  
14 asking the Legislature for more money in this program. As  
15 it has been pointed out, this program is a model for the  
16 country. It's not just important we get it right here.  
17 It's important we get it right so other folks in other  
18 states can see a well functioned program. And I think  
19 spending a couple more million dollars to increase the  
20 speed with which people get paid, to increase enforcement  
21 to make sure there's not fraud, I think is an appropriate  
22 expenditure. And you know, if you need a legislative  
23 vehicle for addressing that issue, we are happy to  
24 accommodate. Thank you very much for the time.

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Mark.

1 Any other comments?

2 Well, I guess that's going to close the hearing.

3 But I take point with what's been said by all the  
4 speakers. First of all, the staff, thank you guys. Well  
5 done. Yoman's job. Thank you for all the Board members  
6 to show up at the public hearing. That's great.

7 And as I said earlier, and Bob and Mark and  
8 Leonard, we've all been in the streets doing this stuff  
9 for a long time. And it's just going to take some  
10 adjustments. But I mean, we're well along the way. And  
11 if we just keep our eye on the ball, we'll be fine and  
12 we'll meet the 13th. And we're going to have to gear up  
13 for this like anything else. The same thing happened with  
14 AB 2020. I would like to thank everybody for being here  
15 today. And there's a question. Hold on.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I just have one  
17 question. Mr. Lang brought up the fact that there needs  
18 to be public education of this program.

19 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: Yes. Shirley  
20 Willd-Wagner, Manager --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Do you know where we  
22 stand on that and what extent of public education we're  
23 involved in?

24 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: Sure, Shirley  
25 Willd-Wagner, Manager of the Electronic Waste Recycling

1 Program.

2 The Office of Public Affairs has let a contract.

3 We do have authority from the Board for a one million

4 dollar contract; 500,000 in this current fiscal year,

5 500,000 in fiscal year 06-07. My understanding from Jon

6 Myers is the RFP is on the street right now, and I believe

7 proposals are due the 9th -- 15th or the 9th. Very soon,

8 anyway. So we hope to be able to review those proposals

9 and have a contract in place within the next month or so.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: And the one million

11 dollars is to develop a program or to actually --

12 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: To develop and

13 implement. It would actually provide public education. A

14 lot of the -- the scope is actually submitted to the Board

15 for approval. And a lot of the scope details outreach

16 through the retailers to consumers. So providing point of

17 purchase information, maybe some training for the

18 retailers so they can get the information to the public,

19 also some direct outreach, partnerships with manufacturers

20 and partnerships with recyclers also. I can look up or we

21 can send you again the scope of work and --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Because a million

23 dollars really isn't a lot to educate the public

24 statewide.

25 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: It's not the 10

1 million that the Department of Conservation spent on  
2 bottles and cans.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: This is a drop in the  
4 bucket of really what you need. But I remember somebody  
5 showing me some television spots.

6 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: Television spots  
7 have been produced under the old \$200,000 contract --

8 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Whatever happened to those?  
9 Did those ever air? Because that's expensive to buy time  
10 unless somebody is willing to do it.

11 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
12 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: With some of  
13 the money left over in the previous outreach allocations,  
14 those PSA spots, both the radio spots and the television  
15 spots, have been placed with renewed effort in three major  
16 media markets. I want to say San Diego, L.A., and  
17 Sacramento -- the Central Valley, not the San Francisco  
18 Bay Area.

19 A noteworthy accomplishment was the placement of  
20 the television ads in the Wal-Mart video loop that plays  
21 on all the screens in Wal-Mart stores. So when shoppers  
22 are being greeted at the Wal-Mart, they can see the  
23 boards, PSAs that describe e-recycle and what to do with  
24 old covered electronic waste, all electronic waste.

25 BOARD MEMBER PEACE: Do you know to what extent



1 we can encourage the haulers that do put out their  
2 quarterly newsletters or whatever for them to have  
3 something in their newsletters?

4 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
5 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: As part of the  
6 contract that Shirley was talking about, one of the  
7 primary responsibilities will be to find ways to leverage  
8 admittedly limited resources through local government,  
9 through haulers, through retailers, through manufacturers,  
10 through, you know, other stakeholders. Because you're  
11 very correct, a million dollars doesn't buy anything.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: How did they come up  
13 with the million dollars?

14 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
15 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: It's in  
16 statute.

17 BRANCH MANAGER WILLD-WAGNER: It's in statute we  
18 can spend up to one percent of the fund on public  
19 education and outreach.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Also Mark Murray and  
21 Mr. Lang mentioned the cancellation requirement. Is that  
22 also in statute?

23 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
24 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: No.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Is that something we

1 came up with?

2 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
3 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: Cancellation  
4 was a construct used by the Bottle Bill and that we at the  
5 Waste Board incorporated into our regulations to, well,  
6 remove items from the waste stream. That once they are  
7 removed and canceled, they cannot circulate back through  
8 the payment system churn, I guess is the technical term,  
9 for multiple payments. The idea being that you know when  
10 a device was at the end of its life, deconstructed, its  
11 components sent to market, recycled, as opposed to paying  
12 at someplace prior to that with uncertainty about where  
13 that item would go, would be passed on to another  
14 collector and claimed again.

15 What we heard today from many of the commentators  
16 we have a real challenge ahead of us to look at  
17 alternative means to pay for the handling and management  
18 of this material if we are going to look at something  
19 other than tying it to the cancellation of devices.

20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you.

21 Any other comments?

22 ELECTRONIC WASTE RECYCLING SECTION ELECTRONIC  
23 WASTE RECYCLING SECTION SUPERVISOR HUNTS: Mr. Chair,  
24 since this was a consideration item, though the public  
25 hearing portion was only slated for the Committee and

1 given the complexity of the comment we've heard both today  
2 and received in written comments, Program I believe would  
3 like to request that item be pulled from the Board agenda  
4 of next week so we can simply focus our efforts on  
5 understanding, evaluating, incorporating the comments and  
6 coming back in June.

7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You're way ahead of me.  
8 We'll have this come back to Committee in June most  
9 definitely. Great. Thanks, everybody. Very well done.  
10 Okay. It is adjourned. Thank you.

11 (Thereupon a lunch recess was taken.)

12 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We're going  
13 to get started here on the workshop that's an overview of  
14 waste characterization studies and tools. And for those  
15 of you who are here in the room and you don't have a copy  
16 of the slides, they're on the back table. And they're  
17 also posted on the website for those few who are listening  
18 in and want to follow along with the slides.

19 So my name is Lorraine Van Kekerix. I'm the  
20 Acting Deputy Director for the Diversion, Planning, and  
21 Local Assistance Division. And one of the things that we  
22 do is we characterize the types and amounts of materials  
23 that are in the waste stream. This is very important in  
24 terms of Board policy decisions.

25 And we have Nancy Carr here who's going to be

1 giving us the presentation, and she will be answering any  
2 questions you've got about characterization, as well as  
3 Tomas Ruddy, who also works on characterization data  
4 within the Diversion, Planning, and Local Assistance. So  
5 I'm going to turn this over to Nancy, and we'll get  
6 started.

7 This is real informal. So when you've got  
8 questions, pop your hand up, and we'll answer. We also  
9 have people here from the Market Development group to talk  
10 to you about uses of the data and how the data is used.  
11 And they will follow Nancy. So Nancy, here you go.

12 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
13 presented as follows.)

14 MS. CARR: Sorry to show you this slide right  
15 after lunch.

16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We're used to it.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. CARR: Waste characterization really is  
19 trying to find out what is in the garbage. So what is in  
20 this giant pile here?

21 --o0o--

22 MS. CARR: So what is waste characterization?  
23 It's collecting data on the types and amounts of materials  
24 in the waste stream, as Lorraine mentioned. How much  
25 paper, food, glass, metal, et cetera, is in that pile of

1 garbage that we just saw.

2           You can collect data on what's disposed, what's  
3 diverted, or both. And the 1990 base year studies that we  
4 talked about at the last workshop, that's what  
5 jurisdictions did in 1990. They collected data on both  
6 disposal and diversion.

7           You can collect data at landfills from garbage  
8 trucks dumping at the landfill or you can also collect  
9 data directly from the generator, from dumpsters or trash  
10 cans at the businesses or residences. That's an important  
11 distinction we'll talk about more later.

12           Most recent studies have only looked at what's  
13 disposed, what's left in the waste stream, not what's  
14 diverted. So it's kind of different from what everybody  
15 did in 1990.

16                               --o0o--

17           MS. CARR: And why is it important? Well, waste  
18 stream information is needed to assess and plan diversion  
19 programs and waste management strategies.

20           We need to not only know what is in the waste  
21 stream, but where it is coming from. So in a nutshell, I  
22 like to think of it as, if you'd like to divert material  
23 out of the waste stream, you need to know what's in it and  
24 where it's coming from.

25                               --o0o--

1 MS. CARR: So how do you do a waste  
2 characterization study? There's a few steps. You take  
3 samples of garbage from trucks or dumpsters. You sort the  
4 materials into different types. You record the weights of  
5 those materials in each sample and then you compile the  
6 data. So we have a little virtual waste characterization  
7 study here.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. CARR: Here's a truck dumping at a transfer  
10 station. So you randomly pick trucks as they're coming in  
11 and ask them to dump for you.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. CARR: And then you take a giant scoop of  
14 that waste and put it on a tarp. That's your waste  
15 sample.

16 --o0o--

17 MS. CARR: You sort that sample into the  
18 different material types. You put all the paper together,  
19 all the glass together, all the metal together, et cetera.

20 --o0o--

21 MS. CARR: And this is what you end up with.  
22 This contractor that's done our studies, they like to use  
23 laundry baskets, so they put all the aluminum cans in one  
24 laundry basket, all the wood in another, all the different  
25 material types.

1 --o0o--

2 MS. CARR: And then they weigh each material type  
3 in each sample to get the data for each individual sample.

4 --o0o--

5 MS. CARR: And you compile all this data together  
6 and you end up with this, which is the detailed  
7 information on the overall disposed waste stream for the  
8 state that we did in 2003. And I just wanted to point out  
9 there's a lot of data on this slide, but it's broken down  
10 into main categories. We have eleven paper types, six  
11 glass types, et cetera. Well, that's kind of a lot to  
12 absorb at once.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. CARR: So you can kind of look at it overall  
15 by each main type to see how the waste stream really  
16 breaks down. So you can see from this pie chart, the  
17 largest amount of material is the organic fraction, which  
18 consists of food and yard waste and things like that.  
19 Number two is construction and demolition at about 22  
20 percent of the waste stream, and paper at about 21  
21 percent.

22 --o0o--

23 MS. CARR: So that's kind of how you do a waste  
24 characterization study in a nutshell. There's a few --

25 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: How do you select

1 geographically where you're going to do it? And then how  
2 do you make sure it's representative of what people in  
3 that geography generate if you're just picking trucks  
4 randomly?

5 MS. CARR: What we have done in the statewide  
6 studies in the past is divide the state into different  
7 regions, five regions that are similar. North coast is a  
8 region. The central valley is a region. And then we  
9 compile a list of all the disposal facilities in that  
10 region and make a list of it and then assign a random  
11 number to each one. And then just randomly start at the  
12 top of the list and go through and recruit the facilities  
13 to participate in the study. We start calling number one,  
14 see if their operations match what we need for the study  
15 and if they're willing to accommodate. So we just go down  
16 the list until we get the number of sites we need. We  
17 usually do four or five sites per region.

18 And then once we pick a site, and we're there on  
19 a sampling day, you want to randomly pick the trucks so  
20 you don't introduce any bias into the study. So we'll  
21 pick like every tenth truck, every fifteenth or whatever,  
22 so you aren't picking something that looks you think  
23 should be representative.

24 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: And I assume even though  
25 these are statewide figures, in your five regions the pie



1 may look different.

2 MS. CARR: Yes. It may look different.

3 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: Okay.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Are the organics being  
5 the biggest percent of the waste, because composting --  
6 don't they all qualify for composting?

7 MS. CARR: Most of the types of organics could be  
8 composted. So there's still a lot in the waste stream  
9 being disposed that could be composted.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: That's so surprising  
11 to me.

12 MS. CARR: That's why we do these studies, so we  
13 can find out what's really going on.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: You said in the  
15 organics, it's green waste and food waste?

16 MS. CARR: Uh-huh.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Do you have a breakdown  
18 as to how much is green waste and how much is food waste?

19 MS. CARR: Yeah.

20 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: Food is about half of the  
21 30.

22 MS. CARR: Right. Food is about 15, 17 percent.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Is there a big market  
24 for food for composting?

25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's tough to do because

1 it breaks down real fast. And we have to get a little  
2 sophisticated about how we do this. That's the next s  
3 tep. MS. CARR: Any other questions?

4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: No. Sorry.

5 MS. CARR: Stop me any time you want.

6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Garbage away.

7 MS. CARR: So when you're doing a study -- this  
8 kind of relates to Scott's question --

9 --o0o--

10 MS. CARR: -- you want to determine what are the  
11 goals the study supports and what information should the  
12 study provide to help achieve those goals. And then  
13 another big factor of course is how much is your budget?

14 Now, an example might be say the goal is to  
15 increase the diversion of construction and demolition  
16 waste. Well, the waste characterization study can gather  
17 information on what the main materials are from C&D  
18 activities and what particular activities generate them,  
19 like roofing or construction or demolition or whatever.  
20 And that information can help target diversion programs.

21 --o0o--

22 MS. CARR: So I'm going to go over this list of  
23 possible uses of waste characterization data of -- yes --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: It says how much is  
25 your budget. Whose budget?

1 MS. CARR: The budget for the study.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: For the State for  
3 what?

4 MS. CARR: However much money -- if it's for a  
5 statewide study the Board is doing, however much money the  
6 Board is budgeting for a study. Or for a city that wants  
7 to do a local study, however much money they have budgeted  
8 to do that study.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Okay.

10 MS. CARR: Okay. So some uses. And if you know  
11 people that have been there a little while might recognize  
12 these are uses we've done here at the Board. One thing  
13 waste characterization data does is provide cities with  
14 free data to assess their own local waste streams. Waste  
15 characterization data can provide information to  
16 businesses and schools on the main materials they dispose.  
17 We can determine the amount of a particular material type  
18 such as rigid plastic packaging containers are disposed.  
19 And RPPCs have their own special law, so they're kind of  
20 an important type we've dealt with here at the Board. And  
21 that data was used to help calculate their recycling rate.  
22 It's not my favorite material type either.

23 One of the things it can do is provide  
24 information on organic materials in the waste stream. And  
25 that was important in assessing the impact of a proposed

1 rule by air quality management district to put  
2 restrictions on composting operations a couple of years  
3 ago. It can provide details on film plastic in the waste  
4 stream, provide baseline information on the disposal of  
5 e-waste, and provide information on feedstocks for  
6 emerging technologies.

7           So that's some background on waste  
8 characterization in general, what it is, why it's  
9 important how studies are done, and how the data can be  
10 used.

11           I want to give you an overview of waste  
12 characterization studies done in California specifically,  
13 and you'll see as I go through what some of these points  
14 related to. And then after I talk, Judy Friedman and Bill  
15 Orr I guess and John Smith are going to talk about how  
16 waste characterization data relates to their programs.

17                               --o0o--

18           MS. CARR: So brief recap of characterization  
19 studies in California. Our situation is different from  
20 other states because of how our law was written.

21           So in the beginning, in 1990, AB 939 required  
22 that waste stream data be collected at the local level by  
23 local governments, not at the statewide level. So cities  
24 and counties were required to quantify and characterize  
25 both the waste that was disposed and waste that was

1 diverted. And the total quantity generated was used as  
2 their base year generation amount, and we talked about  
3 that at the last workshop. That's an important number in  
4 calculating their diversion rate.

5           The characterization data was to be used for  
6 local solid waste planning as they're trying to get their  
7 programs together to meet the 25 and 50 percent goals.  
8 When these studies were done way back when, there was no  
9 standard method, and the studies varied a lot in the  
10 methods they used and the quality of data that was  
11 collected. And that's important because these studies can  
12 be expensive. If you're going to spend the time and money  
13 to do them, you want to get good data out of them.

14                               --o0o--

15           MS. CARR: And this is a theoretical waste  
16 characterization study table that was the type of data  
17 collected in 1990. For each material type, jurisdictions  
18 quantified how much of that material was disposed, how  
19 much was diverted. And those two numbers added together  
20 is the amount generated for each material type. And you  
21 add all the material types up together, and you get the  
22 number in that bottom right-hand corner. And that is  
23 their base year waste generation amount, which is used in  
24 their diversion rate calculations.

25                               --o0o--

1 MS. CARR: Well, 1990 was a long time ago. So  
2 what's been happening with characterization studies at the  
3 local level since then?

4 Some of this we discussed at the last month's  
5 workshop. Some cities have gone back and looked at those  
6 original studies and made corrections because they found  
7 errors in them. Some have done new base year studies.  
8 But they really were focusing on quantifying and getting  
9 the amounts of materials disposed and diverted rather than  
10 doing a full-blown study where they went out and did field  
11 sorting. A few cities have done full characterization  
12 studies but not many because they're very expensive to do.

13 Maybe there's something that could be done to  
14 address these issues.

15 --o0o--

16 MS. CARR: Well, as a matter of fact, there was.  
17 Since there were so many problems with the original  
18 characterization studies, the Legislature amended AB 939  
19 to require the Board to develop a standard method that  
20 jurisdictions could use for future studies. And we did  
21 that in 1995. And the method was designed to characterize  
22 disposed waste only. The requirement to gather data on  
23 what's diverted was not included. So that's a difference  
24 from the base year studies. And we included several ways  
25 to collect the data to give jurisdictions options on how

1 they did their study. And at this time, we established a  
2 list and definitions of uniform material types, which we  
3 didn't have in 1990.

4 An important thing that happened now is we took  
5 the opportunity to develop a tool that local governments  
6 and others could use, and that's the waste  
7 characterization database.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. CARR: The uniform method provides guidance  
10 to local governments on how to conduct a waste  
11 characterization to get adequate data, and the database  
12 provides information to help local governments understand  
13 their waste streams without the time and expense of doing  
14 a full waste characterization study.

15 The database was first developed using  
16 information donated by the cities of Los Angeles and  
17 San Diego, because at that time there were the only two  
18 cities in the state that had large generator-based studies  
19 and had the time of data we needed to build the database.

20 --o0o--

21 MS. CARR: Since this database is so important, I  
22 wanted to give you some details.

23 As I said, it was developed in 1995 as part of  
24 the uniform method. It's unique in the nation and really  
25 the world, I think. It was updated in 1999 using data

1 from our first statewide study, which I'll go over in a  
2 little bit. Easy access on the website for local  
3 governments or anyone to use. And it's a tool for local  
4 governments and businesses and others.

5 And it's been used by other states and even other  
6 countries as a model. For example, the state of  
7 Massachusetts used data straight from our database to help  
8 in assessing their own commercial waste stream. They  
9 didn't bother to go out and collect any of their own data.  
10 They just used our data. And Natural Resources Canada  
11 which is a national environmental department in Canada was  
12 looking at using our database as a model for their whole  
13 country.

14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And Mexico.

15 MS. CARR: And Mexico, too.

16 So what I'm going to do now is show you the  
17 database on our website and walk you through it and show  
18 you what's in it.

19 So, Sue, if you could go to the -- I'm not sure  
20 how this mouse is going to work.

21 --o0o--

22 MS. CARR: What the database does is combine our  
23 statewide average waste stream data with local data on  
24 employment and business information and population. So by  
25 combining the average statewide data and the local data,



1 you can get like a custom model for local jurisdictions to  
2 use to look at their waste stream.

3 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: If not many locals have  
4 done it because it's so expensive, how is the latter  
5 aspect that you just mentioned a valuable part of this  
6 website?

7 MS. CARR: I'm not sure what you're asking.

8 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: What I'm asking is,  
9 earlier on you said most locals didn't do their own waste  
10 characterization because it was an expensive process. And  
11 I thought I heard you say this was a customized thing  
12 because you take the statewide average and just blend in  
13 the local information, do the population, and you have  
14 something that's correct or valid. But if not many locals  
15 have done waste characterization studies, how are you able  
16 to make that statement?

17 MS. CARR: Well, let me go through and show you a  
18 couple of screens of what the data looks like, and I'll  
19 explain that as I go through. Okay.

20 The first thing you need to do is select a  
21 jurisdiction. So I'm going to pick Sacramento. And I'm  
22 probably going to be pretty uncoordinated with this mouse,  
23 because I'm not used to it. So give me a minute.

24 The next step is to choose whether you want to  
25 look at commercial sector data or residential. If you

1 look over here, we have commercial sector, there's four  
2 ways to look at the data. And residential, there's one  
3 way to look at the data.

4 Let's start with commercial and let's start with  
5 overall by business group of the four ways to look at the  
6 data. And then you hit submit. And here's the data for  
7 the city of Sacramento. This screen shows the business  
8 groups in Sacramento and the estimated tons disposed by  
9 each group. And the groups are ranked from those that  
10 dispose the most to those that dispose the least so you  
11 can get an idea of what the main business groups are  
12 disposing the most in that particular city. And this will  
13 be different for each city depending on their business  
14 makeup.

15 BOARD ADVISOR BLUE: Is it standard groups by SIC  
16 code?

17 MS. CARR: Right. They don't match SIC codes  
18 exactly because there's 83 SIC codes. So we have 39  
19 business groups. So we would group some of the SIC codes.  
20 One example of a group is financial, insurance, real  
21 estate, and legal, because they're all office type  
22 businesses. So we grouped them together. Some groups  
23 like food stores is just food stores. We didn't group  
24 anybody with them.

25 And if you want to know what is in each business

1 group, there's a link up here that defines them all. So  
2 this is going to be different for each city depending on  
3 what their business makeup is like.

4           So now we have an idea of what the main business  
5 groups are. The next question you might ask is, well, for  
6 these big groups that are disposing so much, what really  
7 is in the waste from these businesses. Well, you might  
8 have noticed the number one business type there is  
9 restaurants. Restaurants are pretty boring. Fifty-six  
10 percent of their waste is food waste. So let's look at a  
11 different one.

12           Let's look at retail trade down here. If you  
13 just click on that link, this is the waste composition or  
14 kind of sometimes call them waste stream profiles for this  
15 business group. So you can see cardboard is the top  
16 material type for retail groups, which you'd expect. They  
17 got a lot of their merchandise coming in in cardboard  
18 crates. So that's something if you were a city looking at  
19 helping your retail businesses recycle, you know this is a  
20 material type you'd want to target.

21           Now to get back to your question of how we  
22 combine the statewide and the local data. The estimated  
23 percent for each material type, that is the standard  
24 statewide average composition data, the percent of that  
25 material type. No matter what city you go to and look at

1 the composition for retail in that city, it's going to be  
2 these percents because we're using the statewide average.  
3 We unfortunately didn't have enough money to go to each  
4 city and characterize the retail in each particular city.  
5 We gathered data from businesses all over the state from  
6 those five regions and combined them to get a statewide  
7 average composition for each of the -- actually, for the  
8 study we did 26 business groups. So this is the statewide  
9 average data from our statewide 1999 study.

10 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: What is a bulky item?

11 MS. CARR: Furniture, mattresses. The question  
12 was what are bulky items. That's down a ways. It might  
13 be, you know, clothes racks or whatever a business might  
14 be throwing away.

15 Okay. So the tonnage amount, though, is custom  
16 for each city, because this is based on the number of  
17 businesses. And really it's based on the number of  
18 employees in that business group in that city.

19 Bendan.

20 BOARD ADVISOR BLUE: So the estimated percent is  
21 derived from, you know, that for each retail group. The  
22 first column you derived from statewide averages. So you  
23 know that for retail businesses, that is the standard  
24 percentage for each one of those categories, cardboard,  
25 paper, food, et cetera. So say for retail businesses,

1 those percentages are going to be the same, no matter  
2 where in the state you go. But then you know for each  
3 city the demographics -- for every city, for Sacramento,  
4 you know how many retail businesses they have. You know  
5 what tonnage is disposed from each one of the businesses  
6 in that city. For Santa Rosa, it's going to be different.  
7 So they actually know how much is being disposed in their  
8 city from those businesses. Is that correct?

9 MS. CARR: Yeah. The way the tonnage is actually  
10 calculated is when we did the characterization study, we  
11 not only gathered information on the materials in the  
12 waste stream, we also gathered information on how much  
13 each business disposed in a year and also how many  
14 employees are at that business. And that gave us what we  
15 call business disposal rate, or in technical terms, TPEPY,  
16 tons per employee per year. So when you have -- and that  
17 is a statewide average number again estimate of, you know,  
18 this particular business type disposes of one ton per  
19 employee per year. And that was data we gathered in the  
20 study.

21 And then you can get from business vendors the  
22 number of employees in each SIC code in each business  
23 group for each city in the state. So if we know it's one  
24 ton per employee per year for restaurants say and we know  
25 they have 500 employees in restaurants in that city, then

1 the database is estimating that for that city they are  
2 disposing of 500 tons per year from restaurants.

3 So it's the business disposal rate, tons per  
4 employee per year, is based on our statewide average that  
5 we collected in our study. And then the employment data  
6 is going to be different for each city based on their  
7 business mix.

8 Any other questions?

9 I just wanted to mention -- I talked a little bit  
10 about the difference between disposal sampling from trucks  
11 at a landfill and sampling from dumpsters at a business.  
12 You have to sample at a dumpster at a business to get this  
13 kind of data. You can't get this at the landfill. This  
14 is from generator sampling. This is from going directly  
15 to the generator and taking a sample from behind that  
16 business. That's what you need to do to get this kind of  
17 data.

18 So we've seen for Sacramento what the main  
19 business groups are and for one of the business groups one  
20 of the main material groups are. What if you're  
21 interested in a particular material type? Okay. We're  
22 going to go back to the first page and show you some of  
23 the other ways of looking at the data.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. CARR: And I have to find Sacramento again.

1 And then we're going to look at the overall by material  
2 type, the second one over here.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. CARR: So this screen shows the overall  
5 estimated composition for the entire commercial sector for  
6 Sacramento as calculated by the database. So all of the  
7 waste compositions from all of the business and all of the  
8 amounts from all of the businesses, we added that all  
9 together to get this.

10 So the materials are ranked from, you know,  
11 greatest tonnage to least. Food is number one again, and  
12 that makes sense because restaurants was the number one  
13 business type for Sacramento. So you'd expect a lot of  
14 food.

15 So now you have an idea of what the main  
16 materials are being disposed. Your next question might  
17 be, where exactly is all that food coming from? So let's  
18 look at that by clicking on this link right here.

19 --o0o--

20 MS. CARR: And this screen shows for that  
21 particular material type food where it's coming from.  
22 Restaurants is most of it you would think. That makes  
23 sense. Food stores is next, and some of these other  
24 sources. And you can do this for any material type by  
25 this drop down. And those other screens I showed you,

1 there's a drop down box you can look at any business group  
2 also. So those are the four ways that you can look at  
3 data for the commercial sector.

4 Now I want to go over the residential data which  
5 is a lot simpler, and you're probably all going, thank  
6 goodness.

7 --o0o--

8 MS. CARR: So let's pick Sacramento again. Now  
9 we're going to go over to the residential sector, and  
10 there's only one way to look at the data overall by  
11 material type.

12 And then this is the waste composition for the  
13 residential sector for the city of Sacramento as estimated  
14 by the database. And again, those percents are based on  
15 our statewide sampling, our statewide average data. The  
16 tonnage amount is based on the number of single-family  
17 homes in Sacramento. And for multi-family, it's again  
18 based on the number of multi-family units in Sacramento.  
19 So this is going to be different for every jurisdiction  
20 depending on what their housing sector looks like.

21 And this shows the material types grouped. So  
22 all the paper is together. You can also look at it as  
23 with the other screens from greatest to least. So for the  
24 residential sector, food again is the number one material  
25 type which is not surprising.



1 Question.

2 BOARD ADVISORY HARVEY: If we've done a 2003  
3 waste characterization study, why isn't that reflective  
4 here? We're still showing a 1999.

5 MS. CARR: Good question. That's because we  
6 haven't had time to update it, because we're in the middle  
7 of ending our 2005 study. We actually started the 2005  
8 study -- well, it started in 2004. We started that study  
9 before we had even finished this one. So we just have  
10 been in the middle of a study, and it's a pretty  
11 complicated study which I'll tell about at the end. We  
12 haven't been able to update the web page.

13 MR. RUDDY: Also for that 2003 study, we did not  
14 have the money to do the type of sampling of businesses  
15 that we did in the '99 study. So the business data we  
16 have for the 2003 study is strictly from landfills, so we  
17 couldn't roll it into this database anyways, because we  
18 had no idea the breakdown of businesses.

19 MS. CARR: We're going to get to that very  
20 quickly as soon as this current study is done.

21 So since we're combining statewide average data  
22 with local data, there can be a lot of local variation.  
23 For example, if a city has a really good paper recycling  
24 program, this database might overestimate the amount of  
25 paper, because it's based on statewide average. If a city

1 has no paper recycling programs, this database is going to  
2 underestimate the amount of paper in the waste stream.

3 So the database can't be 100 percent accurate for  
4 all local conditions. To get a real good local data, you  
5 need to do a local study. But for jurisdictions that  
6 can't do that, the database provides them a way to look at  
7 their waste stream to get an idea. And it's free, and  
8 it's on the web, and they can look at it any time. So I  
9 feel that's a pretty good deal.

10 Bendan.

11 BOARD ADVISOR BLUE: For those jurisdictions that  
12 can't afford to do their own -- and you say it's not  
13 perfectly accurate obviously, would you say it's, you  
14 know, 80 percent to point them in the right direction  
15 good?

16 MS. CARR: Yeah. I would say that.

17 Okay. Before we move on, are there any other  
18 questions about the database?

19 John.

20 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: I am not a Board member,  
21 but can you generate a report that combines commercial and  
22 residential?

23 MS. CARR: The question was can you generate a  
24 report that combines residential and commercial, and you  
25 can. Not directly from the web. We don't have the

1 database on the web set up to do that. But if you know a  
2 little bit about Excel, you can do it yourself pretty  
3 easily or they can just call us up and we can do it for  
4 them if a jurisdiction wants it.

5 Any other questions?

6 Okay. I need to go back to the PowerPoint now,  
7 please, Sue.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. CARR: And I'm going to zip through. I put  
10 these in so it would be in BAWDS. I wanted to show it to  
11 you live in case you had any questions I could -- okay.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. CARR: Anyway, I want to get back to my recap  
14 of waste characterization data in California. And now I  
15 want to talk about statewide studies. But I wanted to  
16 give you some context first of where we stand compared to  
17 other states.

18 A lot of other states have collected waste stream  
19 data in various types of studies. Oregon is my shining  
20 example because they do a statewide study every two years  
21 as required by their statute, and they collect data on  
22 what's disposed and what's diverted.

23 Minnesota did studies in '92 and '99.

24 Missouri did studies in '87 and '97. Those were  
25 statewide studies.

1           Pennsylvania did their first statewide study in  
2   2001.

3           And our first statewide one was in '99, so they  
4   were a little behind us.

5           Florida actually took a different approach and  
6   they didn't do a statewide study. They got data from  
7   countywide studies and put it together to help counties  
8   without studies model their own waste stream. So it's  
9   kind of similar to what we did.

10          And Washington did statewide studies in '87 and  
11   '92, so they were a pioneer way back when. But recently  
12   their 2002 study, they also used countywide studies and  
13   put it together in a way to represent the statewide waste  
14   stream. So they didn't go out and do statewide sampling.

15          And other states have invested in large statewide  
16   studies. Some states have used the data to provide tools  
17   to local governments. But California, we've done both.

18                               --o0o--

19          MS. CARR: Back to our recap. Here's an overview  
20   of the studies the Board itself has done. Our first  
21   statewide study was 1999, and we focused on generator  
22   sampling of the commercial sector to update the database.  
23   And that study we had a pretty good budget. It was about  
24   \$640,000. So that was large enough to accommodate  
25   generator sampling and expand the database.

1           The Board's 2001 strategic plan recognized the  
2 waste stream changes over time, and that called for a  
3 statewide study to be done periodically. And that plan  
4 was fulfilled in 2003 with our second statewide study.  
5 But we had a much smaller budget for that study and we  
6 couldn't do generator sampling, as Tom mentioned. So it  
7 was a more general update of the statewide waste stream.

8           The third study is actually being completed this  
9 month, and that consists of four targeted studies. And  
10 I'll go over that at the end and just give you a listing  
11 of what those four studies are.

12                               --o0o--

13           MS. CARR: So let's start with the 1999 study.  
14 The purpose of the study, of course, was to collect  
15 information on the types and amounts of material still  
16 being disposed in the statewide waste stream. And this is  
17 nine years after 939 went into effect. The study did not  
18 include collecting information on materials diverted  
19 through recycling, composting, or source reduction. It's  
20 disposal data only. And the study emphasized the  
21 commercial sector. And jurisdictions at that time were  
22 focusing on it more to increase their diversion rate.  
23 That study also specifically got data on rigid plastic  
24 packaging containers to help determine the recycling rate  
25 as required by statute.

1           And the results of that study were used to update  
2   the database as I had mentioned before. And that study  
3   was the first time that statewide data was collected using  
4   our own standard method and standard material types.

5                               --o0o--

6           MS. CARR: So that was a pretty big study we did,  
7   almost 1700 samples around the state and over 1,200 of  
8   them were from individual businesses. That's why that  
9   data is so unique. No one has put that kind of effort  
10   into generator sampling in the whole country.

11           We used 25 study sites throughout the state, and  
12   we did over 3600 vehicle surveys at those 25 sites. And  
13   as I said before, the data is unique in the United States  
14   and the world.

15                               --o0o--

16           MS. CARR: Now a little bit about the results of  
17   the study. For the first time, we had the breakdown by  
18   percent of waste disposed from the three main sectors:  
19   Residential, commercial, and self-haul. And we also have  
20   disposal composition profiles for each of those sectors.  
21   The residential sector: Both single-family and  
22   multi-family. The self-haul sector: Commercial  
23   self-haulers and residential self-haulers. And then the  
24   commercial sector, 26 different business groups. And we  
25   put all of that data together from all of those sectors to

1 get the overall statewide composition.

2 --o0o--

3 MS. CARR: So this is one of the important pieces  
4 of information from the results of the study. We've never  
5 had this before what the breakdown was statewide between  
6 the three sectors. So about 49 percent is from the  
7 commercial sector, about 38 from the residential, and  
8 about 13 from the self-haul sector.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. CARR: And here's the pie chart from 1999.  
11 It's like that one I showed you before, but that was 2003.  
12 This is actually '99. But the big players are still the  
13 same. Organic is the number one material type, about 35  
14 percent. Paper is next, about 30. And then construction  
15 and demolition is about 12 percent. And we also had data  
16 for individual material types.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. CARR: And we can do a top ten list of what  
19 the main materials being disposed of are. Food was number  
20 one, about 16. Remainder composite paper is about 10.  
21 And that consists of kind of like the non-recyclable paper  
22 types, that sort of the catch all. It doesn't include the  
23 newspaper, white ledger --

24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Packaging and septic?

25 MS. CARR: Right. Septic packaging, blueprints,

1 photos, things like that. It also includes items that are  
2 a composite of two different things. My favorite example  
3 is like an orange juice can where it's got the paper tube  
4 and a metal end on it. That's a compost item, and it's  
5 different material types joined together.

6 So if you look at this, there is a lot of  
7 compostable and divertable stuff in the waste stream.  
8 This is nine years after AB 939, remember.

9 --o0o--

10 MS. CARR: And here's a screen shot of the  
11 database I just went over just to emphasize again.  
12 Really, the big thing about the '99 study was collecting  
13 generator-based data so we could do these kind of profiles  
14 for 26 different business types. That was a very  
15 significant part of that study.

16 --o0o--

17 MS. CARR: And just to let you know, I'm not the  
18 only one bragging about this database. This is from the  
19 Miami-Dade County website, and they developed a tool for  
20 their businesses also, and they used part of our data for  
21 that. They developed it with a grant from the Florida  
22 Department of Environmental Protection.

23 And they said, "The most extensive and  
24 authoritative source of waste profile data is the State of  
25 California Integrated Waste Management Board's 1999



1 Statewide Waste Characterization Study."

2 That was very nice of them to say.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. CARR: So that's everything about the 199  
5 study.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. CARR: Now let's move on to the 2003 study.  
8 As I mentioned before, it had a smaller budget than the  
9 '99 study, so we had more general information on the  
10 commercial sector. We actually sampled from garbage  
11 trucks that do commercial routes and go to the landfill.  
12 It's basically waste from a bunch of different businesses  
13 in one load. We sampled that way instead of being able to  
14 go to each individual business.

15 Again, we got the statewide percent of waste  
16 disposed from the residential, commercial, and self-haul  
17 sectors. And we got disposal composition profiles from  
18 the residential sector and the self-haul sector and the  
19 commercial sector, but more general. And of course, we  
20 could put those all together to get the overall statewide  
21 waste stream composition.

22 --o0o--

23 MS. CARR: A little bit on the method. Here's  
24 the five regions that we collected data in. And we did it  
25 over four seasons for the first time. In the past we've

1 done two seasons. But we did four this time.

2 We sampled disposal facilities only. We did  
3 about 4,700 vehicle surveys at 22 different facilities and  
4 550 samples; 200 commercial loads, 110 single-family  
5 loads, and 40 multi-family, and 200 self-haul loads. And  
6 the '99 study was a little complicated. We had 98  
7 material types, and that was mainly to accommodate data  
8 for RPPCs and CRVs, California redemption value  
9 containers. And of course, we quantified the waste in  
10 each sector.

11 --o0o--

12 MS. CARR: So what was new was that we got data  
13 for CRV containers disposed in cooperation with the  
14 Department of Recycling. They contributed some money to  
15 the study so we could look at CRVs. We also did RPPCs so  
16 we could calculate the recycling rate again.

17 What was new for 2003 was we set up electronics  
18 or e-waste as their own material category and got data on  
19 four types of electronics. We got more detailed on  
20 plastic film. We have five types of film. For the first  
21 time, we separated carpet as an individual material type  
22 and same with oil filters. We couldn't do generator  
23 sampling, but we did expand the material types.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. CARR: And again, here's one of the main

1 results of the study, breakdown between commercial,  
2 residential, and self-haul. And I wanted to mention the  
3 overall disposal amount statewide is from the disposal  
4 reporting system, which we talked about at the last  
5 workshop. But the breakdown between commercial,  
6 residential, and self-haul we got through the  
7 characterization study. DRS doesn't give you that  
8 automatically. So again, commercial is about 47 percent;  
9 residential about 32; and self-haul about 21 percent.

10 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: I noticed that  
11 construction and demolition is much higher. Organics is  
12 down. Paper is down. Do you attribute those changes from  
13 the '99 study to the economy? Do you attribute the  
14 organics being down to diversion programs or green waste  
15 being calculated or ADC? How do you calculate those  
16 percentage shifts in such a short period of time?

17 MS. CARR: Well, that's a whole other talk  
18 actually. When we got the results of -- I can go into it  
19 if you want. When we got the results of the 2003 study,  
20 we compared it to the '99 study and did see some shifts.  
21 So our question really was, is it due to those things you  
22 mentioned, or can there be some other factors in play?  
23 And I think there are other factors in play that relate to  
24 how the two studies were done, because they were not done  
25 the same way.

1           The '99 study really emphasized the commercial  
2 sector by doing generator-based sampling by collecting  
3 samples from the dumpster. The 2003 study we did the  
4 commercial sector from garbage trucks and also from  
5 roll-off containers from businesses. So those roll-offs  
6 tend to include more C&D type materials because a business  
7 might be remodeling and have a roll-off out there to  
8 collect that kind of waste.

9           We didn't capture as much of that type of  
10 business-generated waste in the '99 study, because if  
11 there was a roll-off at the business the day we sampled  
12 from the dumpsters, we would catch it. But we didn't  
13 catch as many of those types of loads.

14           So I think it is a reflection of the economy  
15 some. And it's a reflection of diversion programs some.  
16 But whether it's as pronounced just due to those things,  
17 I'm not sure about. I don't know -- I would want to look  
18 at it more closely before I made that conclusion, because  
19 the two studies were done differently.

20           BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: It's a huge difference in  
21 C&D.

22           MS. CARR: It is.

23           BRANCH MANAGER ORR: We'll talk about C&D a  
24 little bit more.

25           I think the other thing in regards to C&D is that

1 as Nancy pointed out, we separated out some other  
2 materials. So for example in the '99 waste  
3 characterization study, carpet was listed under organics.  
4 In 2003, it was actually separated out as its own category  
5 in part to see what was being done in terms of carpet  
6 diversion through the national MOU I'll mention a little  
7 bit later. So that would be a C&D material that would be  
8 on top of it.

9           Also, dimensional lumber could go under organics  
10 or go under C&D. There's a lot of things like that that  
11 comes down to the materials that you see at the landfill  
12 versus the activity that generated those materials. And  
13 that's even on top of what Nancy was talking about. A lot  
14 of C&D you don't go out behind the building to find out  
15 what's in the dumpster. The dumpsters -- you may not have  
16 a dumpster from the construction site. You may have dump  
17 trucks and other things going directly to it.

18           And then the last thing is the self-haul that  
19 previously we weren't capturing a lot of information on  
20 the self-haul. And I think there's a lot more  
21 construction and demolition material that goes to the  
22 landfill through self-haul.

23           BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: Can we have a disclosure  
24 on the website that says, "These huge differences may be  
25 attributed to the following," so a reader would know?

1 MS. CARR: Well, what we have on our website is  
2 basically a paper we put together comparing the two  
3 studies that was part of the agenda item that I think it  
4 was the December 2004 Board meeting. And it compared the  
5 compositions and the tonnages directly with and had a lot  
6 of background information. So that document is available  
7 on our website.

8 What we don't have on our website is the direct  
9 comparison. We haven't put that up yet. It's something  
10 we can definitely do when we revise the website and add  
11 all the new information we have from this study as well as  
12 the 2005 study.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. CARR: And here's the pie chart. This is the  
15 very first pie chart I showed you actually. So here's  
16 organic at 30, paper 21, C&D about 22.

17 --o0o--

18 MS. CARR: Here's the top ten materials from  
19 2003. Food is number one again, like it was in 1999.  
20 That didn't change. The number two material type is  
21 lumber. That's kind of a reflection of the increase of  
22 the C&D materials. And cardboard is number three. So  
23 again, there's still a lot of potential for diversion in  
24 our waste stream.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. CARR: I was going to just very quickly go  
2 over the pie charts for each of the sectors, because there  
3 are some differences. This is the commercial disposed  
4 waste. And again, organic is the top 30, paper about 27,  
5 C&D about 14.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. CARR: Residential organic is bumped way up  
8 here to about 43, and that is due to a lot of yard waste.  
9 And then paper about 22. And C&D, you would expect C&D to  
10 be lower in residential loads.

11 --o0o--

12 MS. CARR: But this is the pie that really looks  
13 different, the self-haul sector. C&D is about 55 percent  
14 of this. And this is because what self-haulers are people  
15 who are bringing waste directly to the landfill  
16 themselves. They aren't hiring a waste collection company  
17 to come and get their garbage and take it to the landfill  
18 for them. This tends to be contractors and landscapers,  
19 people doing garage clean outs or business clean outs,  
20 that kind of stuff. So since it is a lot of contractors,  
21 there's a lot of C&D materials in this sector. One of the  
22 things we did in that study was look at the recoverability  
23 of the waste from each sector.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. CARR: So we kind of assigned -- for each of

1 the material types, we kind of determined if it was  
2 recyclable, compostable, or recoverable C&D. Recyclable  
3 would be things like newspaper, white ledger, glass,  
4 metal, aluminum cans. And then the compostable, of  
5 course, would be food and yard waste. And then  
6 recoverable C&D would be like concrete and asphalt, that  
7 kind of stuff. And then the other, the dreaded other.

8           So you can see, you know, over half of the pie is  
9 potentially divertable in all three of these sectors. So  
10 that's the results of the 2003 study.

11                               --o0o--

12           MS. CARR: We are, as we speak, finishing up our  
13 latest study, which we call the 2005 study since that's  
14 really when the data was collected. Since this study came  
15 so close after the 2003 study, instead of redoing that  
16 whole overall statewide waste stream again so quickly, we  
17 decided to instead focus on four specific areas that we  
18 thought were very important parts of the waste stream to  
19 target.

20           So the four were -- and these are the titles of  
21 the reports actually. That's how close we are to being  
22 finished.

23           The first one is Waste Disposal and Diversion  
24 Findings for Selected Industry Groups. So again, this is  
25 generator-based sampling of businesses like we did in



1 1999. What's new for this one is that we also collected  
2 data on what they are diverting, not just what they're  
3 disposing. Those two things put together gives you the  
4 generation for each business type. So we have a big piece  
5 of the puzzle that we didn't have before we will have now.

6 The second study is Characterization and  
7 Quantification of Residuals from Material Recovery  
8 Facilities. And that was a big area that we had never  
9 collected data on before.

10 The third one is getting into more detail,  
11 Detailed Characterization of Construction and Demolition  
12 Waste. That was looking at waste from these particular  
13 activities on their own in detail.

14 And then the fourth study was Detailed  
15 Characterization of Self-Haul and Drop Box Waste. So that  
16 self-haul sector again looking at that in more detail.

17 --oOo--

18 MS. CARR: So you might have noticed as we're  
19 going along these various uses of waste characterization  
20 data we did over the past few years with these different  
21 studies. So you see now that cities can get free data on  
22 their waste stream to help them look at their own waste  
23 stream. Businesses and schools can use the waste  
24 characterization database to look at their particular  
25 business or school.

1           We had the amount of rigid plastic packaging  
2 containers. We did that in '99 and 2003 to calculate the  
3 recycling rate. And we did use the '99 study to respond  
4 to the Air Quality Management District's proposed ruling  
5 on limiting composting operations. We have detail now on  
6 five types of plastic films in the waste stream. And we  
7 have baseline information on e-waste.

8           And another thing that the data can be used for  
9 is looking at feed stocks for emerging technologies. And  
10 actually, data from the 2003 study was presented at the  
11 Emerging Technologies Conference a couple of weeks ago by  
12 a professor from U.C. Davis.

13           So that is waste characterization not necessarily  
14 in a nutshell, but an overview of what we've been doing  
15 the past few years.

16                               --o0o--

17           MS. CARR: So are there any questions?

18           Scott.

19           BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: In 1999, you said  
20 self-haul was about 13 percent. Can you tell me what the  
21 public policy reason was to have a detailed  
22 characterization of self-haul in '05? What were we trying  
23 to get at if that was relatively an insignificant number?

24           MS. CARR: Well, it went up in 2003, for one  
25 thing. And we thought that there would be a lot of -- it

1 would potentially have a lot of divertable material. The  
2 sector like the residential sector isn't necessarily --  
3 isn't going to have a lot of big clean items that could be  
4 diverted, but the self-haul sector can. I've seen  
5 self-haulers come in with a truckload full of cardboard  
6 disposing it at landfill or office furniture or things  
7 like that. So it was the diversion potential is one of  
8 the reasons we focused on that.

9           ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: And  
10 secondary reason for focusing on that is that at the time  
11 the Board was doing biennial reviews of various  
12 jurisdictions, and probably at least a quarter to a third  
13 of the jurisdictions came in to tell the Board that one of  
14 the problems that they were having in meeting their  
15 diversion goals was self-haul. And so we needed to get  
16 more self-haul. That it wasn't people who were using the  
17 residential regular waste service that were the problems.  
18 They have had programs for them. But they didn't know  
19 what was in those self-haul loads, and they believed that  
20 that was the reason that they had not met 50 percent. So  
21 the data in the studies about the divertability and the  
22 complaints that that was one of the primary reasons people  
23 weren't getting to 50 was the reason the Board decided to  
24 go for that self-haul study.

25           MR. RUDY: Actually, we didn't pick these four

1 target areas out of thin air. We actually -- Nancy and I  
2 polled a lot of jurisdictions, a lot of consultants, a lot  
3 of other people. Just as a little background information,  
4 that's how we did that. And we got what type of data  
5 other divisions in the Board, what type of data are we  
6 missing that you think would be most helpful for you. And  
7 we had to limit it to what we could do. But that's how we  
8 picked those four areas. As Lorraine said, that's how the  
9 self-haul got in there.

10 BOARD ADVISOR HARVEY: How do we get divertable?

11 MS. CARR: How do we get it divertable? The  
12 first step is to know what's there and where it's coming  
13 from.

14 The way our laws are set up in California, the  
15 responsibility is really put on local governments to meet  
16 the diversion goals. So when we do studies, we try to  
17 collect data that's going to be helpful to local  
18 governments as well as the Board.

19 Any other questions?

20 Cheryl.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: In terms of the  
22 self-haul down in Chula Vista at the Otay landfill, they  
23 created a whole like staging area kind of thing. Instead  
24 of letting the self-haulers come and dump on the face like  
25 they used to, they come to this staging area where you can

1 back up here and put any metals, back up and there's  
2 concrete, and back up over here, and you know, green  
3 waste. And then they also even have some things set up  
4 from like the Salvation Army and stuff in case you had old  
5 clothing that you were throwing away or toys, you can put  
6 them over there and donate them.

7 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: They're diverting them.

8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's air space.

9 MS. CARR: Any other questions before we hand it  
10 over to the markets folks?

11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Market away. Thank you  
12 very much.

13 BRANCH MANAGER FRIEDMAN: I guess I'm the first  
14 market folk. Judy Friedman with the Waste Prevention  
15 Market Development Division, Organics and Resource  
16 Efficiency Branch.

17 So Nancy did a great overview of waste  
18 characterization. And I'm going to talk a little bit  
19 about how we've used waste characterization information  
20 for the organic's program. As you know, organics in the  
21 waste stream is significant. It's 30 percent at this  
22 juncture. And this data has shown us how significant it  
23 is in general and also the breakdown of what type of  
24 organics there are.

25 The data has helped us shape our program focus,

1 and it has assisted us in multiple program activities,  
2 including the work we've done on South Coast Air Quality  
3 Management District Rule 1133. And now we're about to  
4 embark on San Joaquin Valley Uniform Joint Unified APCD  
5 Rule 4565. We've looked at characterization data for our  
6 work on the Sudden Oak Death disease, and also for  
7 conversion technology. And whether it's the four-county  
8 South Coast Air Quality Management District area or the  
9 twelve counties Sudden Oak Death quarantine area, or San  
10 Joaquin Valley area, it's really imperative that we  
11 understand what are the impacts on the infrastructure and  
12 the jurisdictions as a consequence either these potential  
13 rulemaking or natural threats. And the characterization  
14 data helps us do that in terms of the conversion  
15 technology work that really is the feed stock potential  
16 there. And this has potential impact on statewide and  
17 regional diversion rates both current and future. And  
18 these studies and staff have provided great assistance for  
19 us.

20 --o0o--

21 BRANCH MANAGER FRIEDMAN: We've used the  
22 characterization study to look at the total amount of  
23 organics disposed statewide, and then we've added it to  
24 the amount diverted as through our infrastructure study to  
25 get total generation over organics. And from this, we get

1 the diversion rates of these materials on a statewide  
2 basis. So as you know, we don't get diversion data. So  
3 our infrastructure study looked at what organics is being  
4 proposed or diverted, and then we could use that to  
5 generate total generation.

6 Also it's an important tool for future trends,  
7 such as biosolids and manure. We know that manure and  
8 biosolids management options are limited and becoming more  
9 limited and really currently under serious regulatory and  
10 public scrutiny. So characterization data is a good tool  
11 to track these waste types and consequences of decisions  
12 in this arena. If we see this going up in percentage,  
13 hence more disposal. And it just increases the red flag  
14 potential and what we might need to do about it. That  
15 brings the question.

16 And again, the potential for conversion  
17 technology development, what are the feed stocks and where  
18 are they. So these are just some examples of how this  
19 data is a good tool along with other data we have and  
20 information for helping us shape our program and both  
21 currently and in the future.

22 And John Smith now will go over paper.

23 --o0o--

24 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Thank you, Judy. I'm John  
25 Smith. I head up the Zones and Loans Program. And my

1 secondary function for today is to give you a brief  
2 history of recycled paper and how it relates to this study  
3 and what the study has done to at least re-awaken us in  
4 terms of the opportunity for paper and recycling paper.

5           Since the late 1990s, paper has -- the staff  
6 effort has been substantially decreased. I would estimate  
7 probably the current staff effort on recycled paper  
8 activities is probably around one PY or maybe at a max two  
9 PY. What the waste composition study did for us is it did  
10 show that paper is still being disposed of in a very high  
11 number, so that's 21 percent overall. More specifically,  
12 it showed us that there's some materials that are very --  
13 can be very easily recycled, which there are probably  
14 ready markets for. And the two good examples are  
15 newsprint and cardboard.

16           Also, the study pointed out, as it probably did  
17 in the 1999 study, that the miscellaneous paper or the  
18 paper residue composite category that's been talked about  
19 a lot maybe offers a potential source of feed stock for  
20 the waste conversion technologies.

21           So what the study did was kind of creates some  
22 new interest for recycled paper. And this new interest  
23 has folded into the Board's material assessment action  
24 plan right now. We are looking more closely at newsprint  
25 and cardboard as an opportunity for further recycling.



1 We're also through the disposal information created by  
2 these studies and whatever information we can get from a  
3 diversion study looking at the potential feed stock offers  
4 for -- the potentially composite residual component offers  
5 for waste conversion technologies.

6           There aren't any current -- we don't have any  
7 real current estimates for good numbers for diversion in  
8 California, but the American Forest and Paper Association  
9 does do annual -- it's not really like a survey, but they  
10 create estimates each year, and the last year they created  
11 data for us for California, and that was at 54 percent for  
12 all paper types. Typically, they don't count the same  
13 thing we do. So I think probably the estimate is more  
14 closer to the lower 50s. But as a result of the work we  
15 are doing on the Materials Assessment Action Plan, I think  
16 we brought American Forest and Paper Association back into  
17 the fold, and they are showing interest in terms of  
18 helping us do a diversion survey of paper, specifically  
19 cardboard and newsprint.

20           CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: John, when we start to  
21 look at the CT, conversion technologies, all the stuff  
22 will have to be MRFed, and these will probably be dirty  
23 MRFs in the front end. We estimate maybe the recovery  
24 rate of some of the corrugated that goes into the strip  
25 mills and stuff we're not getting now that's going to

1 landfill, we're going to kick up that recovery rate  
2 between 10 and 20 percent with those dirty MRFs. We're  
3 going to really increase the recovery rates of a lot of  
4 these materials.

5 BRANCH MANAGER SMITH: Thank you.

6 Where did I leave off?

7 Other uses of the study data. Certainly we'll be  
8 able to -- we now have more information -- with waste  
9 composition data, we'll now know based on the model that's  
10 been developed by Nancy and her crew, we can now look at  
11 who the big generators are. And we can tailor -- we can  
12 now know where the paper is coming from and can tailor  
13 diversion programs and future market development programs  
14 with materials that will be collected.

15 We'll also when we do the Materials Assessment  
16 Action Plan be able to based on the information in the  
17 database as Nancy alluded to earlier -- or described will  
18 be able to develop detailed waste composition data for  
19 each of the counties that -- all the counties of the  
20 material assessment action plan. And that will give us --  
21 will be one of the numbers for evaluating determining  
22 recovery rates. So we all have diversion, and we'll have  
23 disposal, and we'll have individual diversion rates for  
24 the counties for the materials we're looking at.

25 So in conclusion, the waste composition study

1 certainly has elevated paper to a covered material,  
2 concern material. Now we have an opportunity to divert  
3 more and create more markets.

4 Any questions? Okay.

5 Bill.

6 --o0o--

7 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: I'm Bill Orr with the Waste  
8 Prevention Market Development Division, Recycling  
9 Technologies Branch.

10 I alluded to some of the remarks I'll be making  
11 now when I was speaking earlier about how the waste  
12 characterization studies were different between 1999 and  
13 2003. So on C&D what I'd like to start off by is talking  
14 a little bit about what C&D is and how it is or isn't  
15 covered by the waste characterization studies, talk about  
16 how it's used for targetting and setting program  
17 priorities, and then on the back end measuring program  
18 effectiveness.

19 --o0o--

20 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: In terms of what is C&D,  
21 basically C&D is a grouping of materials, the 22 percent  
22 of the waste stream that we looked at. But in addition to  
23 that, C&D is organics as you saw earlier. Lumber is like  
24 the number two component of the waste stream. So  
25 dimensional lumber clearly comes from C&D. But there are

1 other ones that sort of cross over between organics and  
2 C&D. For example, land clearing and grubbing activities  
3 when you prepare a site to build a building, you're going  
4 to have other things like stumps and other large organic  
5 components that would cross over between them.

6 In addition, plastic, C&D as plastics. Basically  
7 carpet is a major component. There's a lot of things like  
8 house wrap and other materials that are used. There's a  
9 lot of things that are being substituted, like for example  
10 the trim. When I bought my house a couple of years ago,  
11 things that used to be made out of concrete or some other  
12 masonry material are now made out of expanded polystyrene.  
13 So don't climb on that railing on your house, because you  
14 might poke right through it. They just stucco right over  
15 it. There's a lot of things that are currently part of  
16 the house or part of a building that are now plastic that  
17 used to be another material type. That's true for a lot  
18 of other things.

19 And then finally, paper. And you know, John just  
20 talked about paper as a general commodity. But from a  
21 construction and demolition material perspective,  
22 corrugated cardboard is like the fourth largest component  
23 of the C&D waste stream. So when you were looking at the  
24 self-haul, that's probably reflected a lot, not only the  
25 concrete, asphalt, and so forth, but a lot of that

1 self-haul material is packaging from items that are put  
2 into buildings. So whether it's the dishwasher or the  
3 cabinetry or whatever it is, if it comes in a cardboard  
4 box, it's going to be hauled off to the landfill. So  
5 there's a lot of things that may not show up in that 22  
6 percent. What you might actually see is that the C&D  
7 portion of the waste stream if you look at construction  
8 activities may be closer to a third of the waste stream.  
9 But you know, then you get into sort of double counting  
10 issues. So it's a lot.

11 --o0o--

12 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: In terms of sectors, a lot  
13 of different ways you can slice this pie as well. You've  
14 already heard about the commercial, residential, and  
15 self-haul. But from a construction standpoint, if you  
16 look at the types of activities you've got, you've also  
17 got new construction, meaning you build a house. You  
18 build a school. You build a public building. But then  
19 you also have probably almost half of the construction  
20 activity that's going on is actually in remodeling or  
21 additions. So again you're going to see lot of the  
22 material showing up at the landfill through self-haul and  
23 coming not from new construction, but either renovation or  
24 modernization activities.

25 And finally, a fairly significant part of the

1 material is generated when you tear down buildings. So  
2 that's sort of a mix of the variety of activities.

3 And then as I mentioned earlier, the main  
4 categories of materials would be lumber, corrugated  
5 cardboard, concrete which we're currently targetting in  
6 the Green Procurement Action Plan to increase its use in  
7 products such as road base and other projects like that,  
8 drywall or gypsum and carpet. So those are the main  
9 components of construction and demolition materials.

10 --o0o--

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: What is drywall  
12 composed of?

13 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: It's mainly consisting of a  
14 slurry of gypsum, which is a crushed very fine powder that  
15 is manufactured in sort of a liquid form. And then it's  
16 placed between two layers of mixed paper. It will have  
17 some additive. Sometimes it will have things like  
18 fiberglass and things like that inside of it. But it's  
19 basically gypsum which between two layers of paper. And  
20 usually the face of the paper or the paper on either side  
21 is high recycled content face paper. The interior core  
22 typically has less than 10 percent recycled content in it.  
23 There is a specific type of drywall which is called  
24 synthetic gypsum which is actually made from a byproduct  
25 from coal fired power plants. They're sort of pros and

1 cons as to whether that's the best form of gypsum or not.

2 But that's what drywall is made of.

3 --o0o--

4 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: In terms of measuring  
5 program effectiveness, a couple of things that we have  
6 used waste characterization study data for or plan to in  
7 the future. The first one is the national carpet MOU.  
8 The Board is actually a signatory for Cal/EPA in this  
9 national effort. The Board has been monitoring progress  
10 on the development of infrastructure. It's a ten-year  
11 MOU. And I think we're about three or four years into it.  
12 John Blue of my staff was actually at the annual meeting  
13 last week, so I would expect for the Board to be hearing a  
14 report on how things are going in probably two months on  
15 that.

16 Recycled aggregate, as I mentioned, that's  
17 currently targeted through the Green Procurement Action  
18 Plan.

19 Also, we also get in combination with actual data  
20 going across the scales, we get feedback on how C&D  
21 ordinances are working. In fact, in a couple of  
22 instances, what's been determined is that just by having a  
23 C&D ordinance has had a result of about 3 percent  
24 diversion percentage just by adopting a C&D ordinance. So  
25 it's been a pretty effective tool.

1           Also down the road hopefully to help monitor the  
2 effectiveness of the State Green Building Executive Order.

3           And then similar to what John Smith was  
4 mentioning also as a mechanism for feedback on the  
5 materials flow and economics through the Market Assessment  
6 Action Plan where we've actually developed flow charts for  
7 each of these major materials. And then we'll be going  
8 out and doing jurisdictional surveys to find out the  
9 throughputs of the various materials. So that's on the  
10 C&D side.

11           Are there any questions before I move on to  
12 plastics?

13                               --o0o--

14           BRANCH MANAGER ORR: Okay. In terms of plastics,  
15 a little bit of background on plastics. I've come up with  
16 sort of a term I like to use, the three Vs of plastic.  
17 You probably have never heard that one before. Variety,  
18 volume, and value.

19           And I think what that's important about is first  
20 of all, as you heard earlier, there were a whole bunch of  
21 different kinds of plastics that had been included in the  
22 waste characterization studies, both in terms of  
23 containers, RPPCs, and in terms of the film as well. But  
24 it basically comes down to the fact there's a variety of  
25 resins that make up the plastics waste stream. And



1 they're not compatible largely in terms of diverting them  
2 and using them with each other. So we've done a really  
3 good job and worked very closely with Nancy and her staff  
4 to come up with basically commodities that we can target  
5 for the various plastic activities.

6 The second thing is volume. While plastics may  
7 only be about 9 percent of the waste stream, it's also a  
8 very bulky component. It takes up air space. So I think  
9 you always have to sort of take the percent of the waste  
10 stream with a grain of salt when it comes to plastics,  
11 because it represents probably --

12 MS. CARR: You might want to clarify our data we  
13 collect, the weight of each material. So that's a big  
14 impact for plastics, because they're so light weight. So  
15 volume is much larger than the weight.

16 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: The volume is much larger  
17 than the weight. So if you multiply by two or so, the  
18 volume it takes up, you're looking at something that might  
19 be occupying 20 percent or more of the air space in the  
20 landfill. So our diversion requirements are built on  
21 weight. But in terms of filling up landfills, that's done  
22 on volume.

23 And then the last thing is value. One of the  
24 things that I think we're seeing is more of an incentive  
25 to divert plastics and to target what can I go after in

1 terms of the plastics waste stream. With the record oil  
2 prices and also high natural gas prices, you're basically  
3 seeing people actually going after types of plastics that  
4 they've not gone after in the past. In fact, earlier at  
5 the Committee meeting, we had a couple of loans dealing  
6 with plastic businesses. Obviously, the Board just  
7 approved a loan a couple of months ago for a film wash  
8 line. So we're seeing a lot of investment and a lot of  
9 opportunities. And people want to know, well, what's in  
10 the waste stream that we can go after and really make it  
11 worth our while.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: Are plastic bags  
13 considered in plastics here?

14 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: Absolutely. As far as where  
15 plastic bags would fit into the scheme of things, that  
16 would be included as part of film plastics which represent  
17 4 to 5 percent of the overall waste stream. And like  
18 Nancy was saying earlier, they actually subdivided film  
19 plastic down into like five different sub-categories. And  
20 we would consider that part of the grocery and merchandise  
21 bag category.

22 On an overall basis as far as the major material  
23 types, plastic also has the lowest diversion rate, about 5  
24 percent if you look across the board. Most of that is  
25 driven by the CRV containers. So when you look at

1 curbside programs, it's basically the deposit that's  
2 driving the recycling rate across the board for plastics.

3 --o0o--

4 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: In terms of how we use the  
5 waste characterization study -- I think this was mentioned  
6 earlier. But up until a couple of years ago, one of the  
7 primary ways that we used the characterization study was  
8 to calculate the annual RPPC recycling rates. The law was  
9 changed two or three years ago, and so we no longer are  
10 required to calculate those rates. So that will not be a  
11 future use of waste characterization study which is sort  
12 of a mixed blessing. But we do still use it for the  
13 purposes of targetting.

14 And so we've sort of broken things down and have  
15 taken in addition to our regulatory responsibilities, the  
16 plastics staff have been undertaking a variety of  
17 collaborative initiatives for the last several years. The  
18 first one focused on the film plastics, and then the  
19 second one that we're currently looking at is how to  
20 increase the collection of containers. So we've used the  
21 waste characterization study to really look at how do we  
22 focus and target on collecting the materials that are out  
23 there in the waste stream.

24 We also will use it on the back end for helping  
25 to measure the success of these voluntary efforts. And

1 then again like C&D and paper, this will be part of the  
2 Market Assessment Action Plan. Some of the future uses  
3 that we might be able to look at is while we do collect  
4 seasonal data on a quarterly basis, there are materials  
5 like agricultural film that have a very narrow window  
6 where they're pulled and go to the landfill. And so some  
7 of the data on things like ag film are probably not truly  
8 representative of how much is really going there, because  
9 you have to be there the two weeks it's going to the  
10 landfill. So I think there are some specialty types of  
11 studies that we can look at as we further our targetting  
12 efforts.

13 --o0o--

14 BRANCH MANAGER ORR: Are there any questions on  
15 plastics?

16 Well, I'll turn it back over to the Lorraine  
17 then.

18 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: I hope this  
19 overview on waste characterization has been educational.  
20 We'd be happy to answer any questions that come up at any  
21 point. Just let us know what your questions are, and  
22 we'll try to get you some answers.

23 We will be coming to the Board with the results  
24 of the 2005 study. So you'll see the next generation  
25 results fairly quickly. But this will give you a good

1 basis for understanding some of the results of the new  
2 studies. And we look forward to hearing Board ideas as we  
3 start to gather ideas on what to do for the study that's  
4 going to be coming up, our next characterization study.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WIGGINS: What kind of ideas?

6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Well, we  
7 ended up with the four targeted studies based on ideas  
8 that were collected from jurisdictions, from staff around  
9 the Board, and from Board members. So if there are  
10 particular kinds of things that are problems -- Bill just  
11 mentioned the ag film, that we might need to do something  
12 different if we're studying ag film. And we want to know  
13 more about that. So that would be one idea of something  
14 that we could look at for our next study. And we gather  
15 those ideas. We keep a running list. And as we get  
16 closer to starting that new study, we sit down and hash  
17 them all out and get input on them.

18 Rick.

19 BOARD ADVISOR DUNNE: One of the problems that  
20 you've got is in the initial study and the studies in 2003  
21 and this one, you don't have the baseline that you can go  
22 across all of those and run comparison. I think while  
23 you've got ideas from Board members and stakeholders,  
24 other people, one of the things you really need is a  
25 constant that goes through all of these studies so at

1 least you have that base. And then you can add onto that.  
2 But unless you have something that is consistent all the  
3 way through, it doesn't matter.

4 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: And that's  
5 an idea that the Board can consider as we're looking to  
6 get their approval on the contract for the study. If they  
7 want us to do a standard methodology throughout so that we  
8 have a baseline and add other things on to that, we can  
9 look at that.

10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.

11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: So thank you  
12 very much.

13 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste  
14 Management Board, Sustainability and Market  
15 Development Committee Adjourned at 3:05 p.m.)

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, TIFFANY C. KRAFT, a Certified Shorthand  
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered  
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the  
6 foregoing hearing was reported in shorthand by me,  
7 Tiffany C. Kraft, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the  
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into  
9 typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
11 attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any  
12 way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
14 this 16th day May, 2006.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 TIFFANY C. KRAFT, CSR, RPR

24 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25 License No. 12277

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.